

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1870.

The Week.

THE week has been full of peace rumors. Whether there is anything in them, and if so, how much, it is almost useless to speculate. The general tenor of advices from Europe goes to show that the neutral powers would, of course, be glad of peace, and that the belligerents would be more glad of it than they would have been a month ago; and that somehow—we don't well know for what reason—England has been generally fixed on as the power whose duty it is in an especial manner to bring it about. The London Positivists, in combination with the redder democrats, have been trying to stimulate the Ministry into action by rather violent demonstrations in the streets, which, however, look far more formidable than they are. The "International Association" of workingmen has undoubtedly something to do with the movement, as the Continental members are boiling over with eagerness to get the soldiers out of the way and get the French Republic into their hands—France being, amusingly enough considering the feelings of the great mass of the population, the country above all others in which the more ambitious social reformers expect to realize their dreams about capital and property. Whatever the influence under which he is acting, there seems to be no doubt that Earl Granville is trying to intervene; and there is at this writing talk of an armistice to permit the election of the Constituent Assembly. The fall of Toul, and Soissons, and Strasbourg have rendered this less difficult for Bismarck to concede than it was a fortnight ago.

Most of these announcements, simultaneously coming from London and Tours, agree with each other. Earl Granville, through Lord Lyons, has taken the initiative. The co-operation of the Courts of St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Florence is either promised or expected. Communications have been made both at Tours and Versailles, and have been favorably received. The overtures refer chiefly to the conclusion of an armistice, during which the elections for a Constituent Assembly should take place, which, after its convocation, should immediately deliberate on a basis of peace. It is asserted that King William is favorable to the scheme, but that Bismarck insists that an armistice must involve "a practical basis;" that is, the concession, by the Government of National Defence, of "the principle of cession of territory." Whether this "principle" was distinctly mentioned by Lord Lyons to the Government at Tours, we do not know; but, however it was, Gambetta answered that he and his associates on the Loire could do nothing without the concurrence of their colleagues in Paris, whither he would send M. Thiers, if a safe-conduct could be obtained. This, we hear further, Bismarck is expected to send, assenting on a proposal by Earl Granville to open the negotiations by a personal meeting with the old French statesman.

Besides these negotiations, we hear of others going on between King William and Marshal Bazaine, and it is stated that an agreement has been matured, according to which the Empress Eugénie is to proceed to Versailles, there to sign a treaty of peace, as the legitimate representative of the Imperial Government, the only one recognized by the King. Eugénie, of course, is to become regent, and Bazaine the main staff of the restored Empire, and Prussia to be satisfied by large cessions. These negotiations are said to be carried on chiefly through General Boyer, and to be favored by the Court of Russia. Strange as these reports sound, they seem to have caused some uneasiness at Tours. It is not at all impossible that rumors of this kind are intentionally spread by Bismarck, in order to make the republican rulers of France more readily inclined to listen to proposals of peace addressed to them. That till now they have uniformly spurned every intimation to purchase peace at the price of territory, is evidently owing

to popular pressure rather than to their own blindness or political fanaticism. The influence of the Tours press in this respect appears as pernicious as that of any press has ever been to the true interests of a people distracted by disasters.

Scarcely had the news of attempted diplomatic intervention by England become known at Tours, when the journals and public began to abuse that power in concert. Some saw in the whole affair but a Bonapartist plot; most agreed that it was done chiefly in the interest of Prussia. England, they wisely demonstrated, must have become aware that her friend, Prussia, had undertaken a task beyond her power; that Paris could not be reduced; that the vast French armies now raised in the provinces were ready to take the offensive; that, on his part, General Trochu was preparing a series of formidable sorties; that the Prussians were threatened by hunger no less than by the sword, while France was prepared for all sacrifices to save the national honor. And the first-fruits of this concert of voices were a semi-official note, affirming "that the Government in no case will accept a peace humiliating to France," and "will remain firm in its rejection of all propositions for the dismemberment of France"—which, whether seriously meant or not, augurs very ill for the peace negotiations. And, in fact, we hear that the initiator of them, Earl Granville, has little confidence in their success.

There is one feature in nearly all the comments of neutral peace-makers on the war which fills one who looks back a little way with surprise, and that is their horror over its "wickedness," and over the perversity and blindness of the combatants in going on fighting, instead of dropping it just where they stand, and going home. Ever since the appearance of a public conscience about war—that is, about fifty years ago—the nations engaged in war have treated their particular struggle as peculiarly "holy," and the men who fall in it as martyrs, while nearly all the bystanders have held up their hands over the guilt of it. There could hardly have been a better illustration of this than was afforded by our civil war. The great mass of Europeans looked on it as the most outrageously causeless and futile struggle a civilized people ever engaged in, and many an intelligent Englishman and Frenchman—anti-slavery men, too—ascribed the persistence of the North to simple thirst for blood. The European public, too, generally considered the arrangement of the terms of peace, the simplest thing in the world—though there was hardly any American, except Horace Greeley, who did not shrink from it, as a task almost too serious for human powers, and who did not prefer leaving it to the sword. It is now very interesting to watch the subjection of the Franco-Prussian war to the same half-blind analysis. There is hardly a creature, male or female, no matter how silly or ignorant, here or in England, who does not think himself fully competent to show the Germans the folly and guilt of getting themselves killed, and the perfect safety with which they may take Jules Favre's word that France will never want to go to war again for anything this world can offer her.

Little of importance has taken place during the week in and around Paris, so far as our information goes. French reports, brought by balloon and unofficial, speak of Prussian repulses on previous days, and extol the activity of General Trochu—who is said to be preparing for a formidable sortie—the warlike spirit of the Parisians, and the excellence of the gunners who man the forts. These reports, however, go no further than the 21st, since which time no campaign news has been brought by aerial messengers. A Prussian despatch from Versailles reports the discomfiture of a sortie made by the French on the 22d from Fort du Mont Valérien. Though supported by forty field-guns, the assailants were successfully resisted by detachments of two divisions of infantry of the line and a regiment of landwehr, until the arrival of the Fourth Corps decided the engagement in favor of the besiegers—the French

retiring with a loss of one hundred prisoners and two guns. There are indications that the Prussians are actively engaged in making preparations for a general bombardment. On their part, the French gunners are busy shelling the enemy's outposts and sweeping the approaches to the ramparts. The gap, on the northwest of the city, between Mont Valérien and St. Denis, is said to have been strongly fortified with earthworks.

The military movements around Orléans and Blois, on both sides of the Loire, are—to use an expression often repeated in reports from Tours—shrouded in mystery. The Prussians hold Orléans in great force, and have occupied all the places around, extending in a semi-circle from Châteaudun, on their extreme right, to Châteauneuf, on their extreme left, their reserves in the meanwhile entering Chartres; but whether they have made any movement in advance from La Ferté-St.-Aubin in the direction of either Tours or Bourges, we are unable to discover. The latter place, on account of its military stores and arsenals, may be an even more tempting objective point than the provisional seat of the French Government. Besides, an advance on Bourges would also be a movement in the direction of Lyons, in co-operation with the forces advancing from Épinal and Vesoul. Between Vesoul and Besançon, a heavy engagement took place, on the 22d, near Voray, on the confines of the Departments of Haute-Saône and Doubs, lasting—according to a French report—"from nine in the morning until night," and ending with "result unknown." A detachment belonging to the same forces is reported by General Cambriels, the Commander of the Division of the East—headquarters at Besançon—to have been twice repulsed before Châtillon, on the Saône, in the southwest corner of Vosges. General Cambriels is to be aided by Garibaldi, among whose lieutenants, commanding Mobiles Gardes, Francs-tireurs, and volunteers of all nations, we find his son Menotti, the Spaniard Orense, and the Polish General Bosak, a very able partisan chief. The Prussians, however, seem to be little afraid of these feeble preparations for resistance, and push on rapidly in that quarter—other troops in the meanwhile investing or observing the fortified places in their rear; and not only Besançon is threatened, but Lyons, too, hastily prepares for defence.

There is no fresh war news from Metz, and nothing beyond vague reports and rumors concerning the sieges of New Brisach, Bitsch, and Verdun. One of these reports announces a victorious sortie by the garrison of the last-named fortress. Schlettstadt has surrendered. The active siege of Mézières is not yet begun. Thionville and Longwy seem to be left unmolested. La Fère, in Aisne—for which our dailies have La Ferté-St.-Aubin, to the confusion of their readers—was invested, and St. Quentin, north of it, occupied by the troops under the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg; subsequently, however, the Prussian advance in this direction is said, in French reports, to have been abandoned by the Prussians, their forces retiring towards Laon. An advance, in larger force, on Amiens, is reported going on in two columns from Montdidier and Breteuil. There has been some desultory fighting at various places in Normandy, and in the vicinity of Fontainebleau, where the Prussians have occupied Montereau. The gallantry and pluck of the Francs-tireurs is often extolled in the Tours reports, but of the troops of the line there is nowhere any mention. The whereabouts of the "two armies"—"excellent troops, well armed and equipped"—which, according to the organs of the Tours Government, are to make a sudden appearance one of these days, is wisely kept a profound secret.

The American Peace Society and the American Positivists have both determined to ask Bismarck to make peace without further delay. If their asking him is likely to have any effect, it is a pity and a shame they did not ask him sooner. What is more important than all is, however, that the Woman's Suffrage Association of this city, in convention assembled, have "constituted and accredited Mrs. Emilie J. Merriman their peace advocate and commissioner, to proceed, with all despatch, to France, to present the gravest considerations of peace to William, King of Prussia, and to Jules Favre, Minister of Foreign Affairs for France." Of course it would be ridiculous to notice such

bits of ineffable folly as this if the people who perpetrated them were not adults, and were not engaged day and night in trying to persuade the world that it would be far better governed than it is if they had a share in the work. One of the most curious phenomena of the day, too, is the savage vehemence with which the charge of hard-heartedness, and want of sympathy with progress, is made against anybody who requests reforming geese to behave like reasonable beings, and not meddle with things they do not understand. Bismarck and Jules Favre will, doubtless, be polite to "Mrs. Emilie J. Merriman;" but is it not too bad, to put the matter on very low ground, that men with such awful demands on their time, and such a strain on their nerves, should have to sit down and listen to the impertinent gabble of such people?

In commercial circles, the effect of the war continues to be insignificant, or at least not readily visible. The destruction of crops and the waste of food by both armies have at last led to some advance in the prices of breadstuffs here, in anticipation of an increased Continental demand; but the advance has not materially added to our exports, owing to the deficiency of vessels to carry them, and the consequent rise in the freights to Europe. Nor has the advance benefited domestic producers, owing to the corresponding rise in railroad freights from the interior, which has prevented grain and flour from coming forward rapidly enough to exhaust even the old crop, much less to market the new; so that at the great grain centres, Chicago and Milwaukee, prices have actually again declined, very much to the disgust of the farmers, and clearly to the emphatic confirmation of all we have ever said of the supreme importance of the entire question of communication. The hopes of an early peace, and the steady tendency of Lancashire manufacturers to return to American cottons in place of East India, have stayed the decline in this our most important export staple, and led to a moderate increase in the shipments, but it is yet too early to form opinions of any value as to the amount that Europe will be able to take of our large prospective crop, or the price it will be able to pay for it. At the present moment, the price per pound is nearly one-third less than last season, so that we should have to harvest one-third more, and sell one-third more, to yield to our Southern States the same net result. It is evident that the latter are more directly interested in the war than any other part of the country. Tobacco and meats, nearly next in importance in the list of our export articles, are materially benefited by the struggle, and remain firm in prices. If our farmers and cotton-planters are injured or not benefited by the war, we have the consolation that everybody will be fed and clothed more cheaply during the coming winter than they have been for years. This is all the more important, as the complaints of unsatisfactory business, even in branches not affected by the war, become daily more general. Cotton-spinners, sugar refiners, woollen mills, the farmers throughout the country, even the coal-miners, complain that they are working without a profit. The dry-goods merchants report a prosperous fall season, and wool-growers have profited by a revival in this long-depressed, tariff-ridden interest. But all accounts agree in representing the trade of the West and Southwest as light, and that of the South as largely done on credit. Real estate, especially unimproved, is decidedly lower; and even the best kind of city dwelling-houses, in spite of an unusually active demand from families driven out of Europe, do not bring a fair rental on recent cost or estimated market value.

The voting in certain Congressional districts at the late elections was so close that victory was fairly claimed by both parties until official returns had been made. This fact, added to false reports in some other cases, makes it necessary to revise our summary of last week in regard to Iowa and Pennsylvania. The first-named State has gone solidly Republican as usual. In Pennsylvania, where majorities range as low as twenty-two, thirteen, and even eleven votes, the Democrats have gained six districts and lost one, making their total gain of Congressmen in the four States six. The significance of this increase for party purposes in the Forty-second Congress is, as we have already remarked, not great; but in both ranks the new members elect will furnish a powerful addition to the free-trade or revenue reform element. The

delegation from Iowa is unanimous in this respect, Mr. Palmer, who voted with the protectionists at the last session, having pledged himself on the stump to favor lower duties on iron, salt, and lumber. Mr. Williams, of Indiana, seems likely to be more decidedly anti-tariff than heretofore, if he remember the declarations forced from him by the necessities of the canvass; while his colleague, Mr. Julian, who was an absentee as well as a protectionist, is succeeded by an avowed Republican free-trader, Judge Wilson. In Ohio, Mr. Monroe, the successful Republican candidate in the Fourteenth District, was nominated in convention at the expense of a protectionist, and the defeat of Messrs. Schenck and McClurg is of course in the interest of revenue reform, though there is an offset in the gain of two Republican protectionists. The five Democrats gained from Pennsylvania are naturally to be counted on the side of free-trade. And finally, in balancing these results, the fact that so many leaders of the protectionists have been retired must be allowed its due weight beside the numerical preponderance.

The only State election which has since occurred is that of South Carolina, about which, however, we have at this writing no positive information beyond the general success of the Republican ticket, with Governor Scott at its head. It is doubtful whether the Reform party has carried one or two of the four Congressmen. The *Charleston Courier*, speaking for it, professes to think it would have had a majority everywhere, as in that city, if the United States law had been applicable in regard to the counting of votes and supervision of the ballot-boxes. In the country, it says, there was abundance of fraud, or of opportunities for fraud, and much violence directed against the Reformers. On the other hand, complaints have been made at Washington of "Reform" outrages on Republican voters since the election. General Grant's interference in favor of his partisans had, doubtless, the effect anticipated. That it will be as useful to the regular Republicans in Missouri we cannot bring ourselves to think, considering the superior intelligence of the average voter there. For the rest, the situation seems unchanged, and Mr. Brown's defiance of the Administration probably continues in force. In this State, the chief interest of the canvass lies in the charges brought against General Woodford in regard to his past connection with Oakesmith, the notorious slaver, and in the preparations for and against the Act of Congress to amend the naturalization laws, and to punish crimes against the same, just referred to. The Government is determined to enforce it, and the Attorney-General has come on expressly to confer about it with the Marshal of this District. The triangular or quadrangular contest in Massachusetts has been opened by a savage speech from Mr. Phillips, to which a correspondent alludes in another place. There seems to have been more than one candidate ready to avail himself of the vote of several parties, and Mr. Chattaway, who was nominated for Lieutenant-Governor by the Labor party, has been repudiated for showing that he valued more highly the subsequent nomination of the Democrats. In Rhode Island, the Republican convention in Mr. Jenckes's district was unable to renominate him or to agree upon a candidate in his place, and the party must make its choice at the polls among the three, including Mr. Jenckes, whose names came before the convention.

"Tom Hughes, of Rugby," as we have heard him called, has gone home, after having made the most effective, and we might, we think, almost say pleasantest, trip ever made by any Englishman in the United States. We doubt if any private man ever met with such a welcome from a foreign country, or ever was so successful in putting a new face on an old story. His lecture in Boston contained nothing but facts which, to the best of our belief, have been laid before the American public about two hundred times without producing much impression; but such is the weight of Mr. Hughes's character that his utterance of them made scores of people confess that their opinions on several points in the *Alabama* case were changed. His lecture in New York was equally successful, and for somewhat similar reasons. When a man of as much truth and sincerity as he, and who has for so many years made the workingman's cause his own, tells workingmen that the remedy for their troubles lies in co-operation—that is, in self-restraint, economy,

and industry, and not in "politics" and blatherskite and strikes—he reaches thousands of ears which have been deaf to everything which, on this subject, has come from honest men of education hitherto. We are glad to say, too, that Mr. Hughes's audience contained a large body of workmen, and many of the leaders of the labor movement.

We are able to say positively that there is not a particle of foundation for the stories which have been set afloat that Secretary Cox's resignation was due to "personal reasons," such as his inability to live on his salary. He knew perfectly what the salary was before he took the place, and has never complained or thought of complaining of it as insufficient. There has been only one cause for his retirement, and that is the failure of the President to sustain him against the politicians in the matter of civil service reform. This would appear fully if the correspondence between him and the President were published. Mr. Cox's lips are sealed for the moment by a very proper sense of official decorum; but his reticence furnishes a strong reason why the President should either publish the correspondence or check the exertions which some of his pretended friends are making to spread false versions of the cause of the rupture. We may add that they are anything but friends of the President who are circulating the report that he and Mr. Cox have had differences about the McGarrahan claim.

Senator Morton, it is positively announced, has declined the mission to England, and may very naturally have come to this conclusion apart from the consequences of the Democratic victory in Indiana. He is supposed, like most American politicians or "statesmen," to have ulterior designs in regard to the Presidency, and though a minister to the Court of St. James has been known to become afterwards President, absence from the country is regarded as almost equivalent to retiring from competition. We do not allege that this was Mr. Morton's chief motive in declining, and can readily believe that reflections on the minister's salary and the cost of living properly in England were enough to decide him against going abroad. It would not surprise us greatly if this latter consideration should deter any one whom Grant is likely to nominate from undertaking to supplant Mr. Motley; in which case an argument would have been found in favor of the meanness of our diplomatic stipends, if not of discontinuing our foreign legations altogether.

It is a comfort to know that all our misgovernment has not prevented New York from becoming the focus of art, literature, and refinement. That, at least, we may believe on Mr. Greeley's assurance, as expressed in a letter to the Convention now assembled at Cincinnati to discuss the removal of the national capital. This preposterous movement has failed to obtain the appearance which it sought, of representing all parts of the country—Governor Hoffman, for one, having declined to appoint a delegate to the Convention, and other governors apparently not having taken even the trouble to decline. Mr. Greeley's recommending New York as the proper seat of government must have been rather a damper to the leaders of the enterprise, as they had not probably counted upon opposition from the East except as against a Westernward removal of the capital. To move it one inch, however, towards any point of the compass, would be as great folly as to move it a thousand miles. To say nothing of the cost of the undertaking, or of the sectional jealousies to be overcome the moment moving was decided upon, there are two facts which outweigh any argument in favor of it: one is, that the eccentricity of Washington is diminished every year by improved means of transportation, and offers already no serious impediment to any Congressman's returning home on an emergency; the other is, that Western men are, and for a long time will be, glad of an excuse to come to the East, which collectively is for them the "focus of art, literature, and refinement." Meantime, careful observers are convinced that Washington is rapidly attracting to itself as regular visitors, or as permanent residents, persons whose society is eminently worth cultivating, and who will draw after them artists and scholars inferior to none in the country. The climate of Washington has been greatly misrepresented, and the surroundings are hardly to be surpassed in natural beauty.

THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

With people who preserve into mature life the childish faculty of being pleased with names while remaining indifferent to the qualities of things, there is little use in discussing the chances of success enjoyed by the persons in France who are now engaged in an attempt to set up a republic. For what we talk of as the "French Republic" is in reality nothing more than a number of men trying to establish one. Whether they will succeed or fail depends not on what they call themselves, or call the state of things which they are trying to bring about, but on the mental, moral, and material condition of the people of France. If a certain number of city missionaries should in troublous times in New York succeed in getting possession of the City Hall, and inducing a portion of the police force to obey them, and should then announce that the kingdom of God was at last established in this city, there would be a great laugh all over the country, and people would ask the reverend gentlemen many unpleasant questions, first about the extent to which their authority was obeyed, and next about the morals and manners of the denizens of Cherry Street and Mercer Street, and divers other slums and purlieus; and the laugh would be all the louder if the missionaries insisted on treating those who doubted their statements as limbs of Satan.

What we are about to say, we say to that rational portion of the community which knows and remembers that politics are made up of facts and deductions from facts, and that we can no more make a republic by giving that name to a form of government than live within our income by making the figures in our account-books balance at the end of the year. We can hardly hope to produce any impression on that large class who look on republics as the divinely-appointed form of government—that is, claim the "divine right" for majorities, and treat progress as simply a long series of attempts to set up republics, foiled by kings and nobles. Progress means the growth of mankind in wisdom, in humanity, and in self-restraint, under whatever form of government, and kings were as natural and legitimate a product of society in certain stages as courts of law or police. They were contrivances to which it resorted for the preservation of order, and which were the only ones suited to its ideas and culture. To treat them as enemies of mankind is about as sensible as to treat pack-horses as the great enemies of rapid transportation. A republic is a governmental contrivance suited to people who have reached a certain stage of development through a certain process of training: to say that a people has not reached this stage is no more a sign of hostility to republican government than doubting a man's fitness to take charge of an observatory is a sign of hostility to the study of astronomy, and of want of sympathy with his desire to better his condition. The French have, unfortunately, not passed through any process of training for a republic, except such as they got in the brief reign of Louis Philippe. They broke with their kings before they had got ready for presidents. Nothing is easier, as they have shown, than for a nation to thrust the past out of its institutions; but no human power can get the past out of a nation's character.

We suppose there is no liberal in the world who would not heartily rejoice to see France in possession of an orderly, democratic government; but the reasons for believing that this great consummation is not within her reach are, unhappily, not far to seek, and some of the weightiest have been brought into very disagreeable prominence by the crisis through which she is now passing. As a general rule, it may be said that a people's success in carrying on a government will depend on their truthfulness; and by truthfulness we do not mean simply the habit of speaking the truth in the transaction of the ordinary business of life, but readiness to face facts just as they stand, without blinking them, or arranging drapery about them, or throwing artificial light on them. This disposition of mind is familiar to everybody as a fundamental condition of success in business; in fact, it forms the most prominent feature in the character of the personage known as "the good business man;" but it is just as essential to the good politician. Now, without admitting the complete accuracy of the witty saying that "the Celtic mind is engaged in a perpetual struggle to escape from the control of facts," it cannot be denied that the attempts the French

have hitherto made to govern themselves have been characterized by a strong dislike of facts, and a sort of desperate determination not to be governed by them, but by some ideal with which the formation of facts had nothing to do. This tendency was strikingly manifested in 1789; it was still more strikingly manifested in 1848; and the downfall of the republic in both cases was due to the arrival at the surface of affairs of men with the sort of truthfulness which consists in seeing facts just as they are, and governing one's self accordingly. The possibility of maintaining a republic in a country blessed or burdened with such traditions as France possesses, in conjunction with a strong executive and a large standing army, of combining love of liberty with love of glory, and the constant exaltation of brute force with popular reverence for law, is a pure product of the imagination. No man could have entertained that notion who had trained himself to look facts in the face. The Bonapartes have owed their rise to their keen and rapid perception of its absurdity, and the fortunate concurrence of circumstances which enabled them to act on their perception.

Another thing necessary to a republic is, that the people should have something in the nature of reverence for a certain order of ideas, or certain legal formulæ—should, in short, strongly incline to and be accustomed to one kind of government rather than another; should, for instance, possess more respect for the acts of a legislature than for the decrees of a monarch, or for the process of a court of law than for a military order. Now, to the great body of the French people all these things possess about equal value and equal claims to obedience. The number of persons in France who are really shocked by the irresponsibility of public functionaries before the courts, and by the power of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment which this places in the hands of the police, and which every régime has kept up, might easily assemble in one New York parlor. To the great body of the population, these things are not only natural, but necessary. In short, a republic must have as a basis either a very high order of mental and moral training, on the part of the mass of the people, or else a whole system of political habits, which will take the place of the conclusions of philosophers and historians. Prévost-Paradol held that the writ of *habeas corpus*, and the responsibility of government officers in damages for abuse of their authority, and a regulated liberty of the press, were necessary to a free government; but he had reached these conclusions through prolonged study and reflection. An Ohio farmer, with only twelve months' schooling, without any reflection at all, would laugh at anybody who questioned them. He holds them as ultimate facts of life, just as he holds the propriety of wearing clothes or paying his debts.

But the French not only have no special faith in any set of political ideas or any particular form of government, but have no attachment, even through the imagination, to any of the proposed plans of government. There are three things possible in France—a legitimist monarchy, an Orleanist monarchy, and a republic. There is not one of them to which any considerable or influential portion of the people is attached. There is not one of them which the nation has not seen overthrown with indifference or approval. There is probably no sentiment more completely dead in French hearts than the sentiment of loyalty. There is one thing, and one thing only, which the majority of Frenchmen ardently desire in the matter of government, and that is security. Any government which can supply this in combination with a fair share of "glory" may be pretty sure of everything in the shape of devotion which the Frenchmen of this generation are capable of feeling towards the powers that be; but security they will have, and they will sacrifice everything else for it. The Republic was proclaimed after the fall of the Empire, not because it was what the French people wanted, but because, as has been said, "it was what there was least division of sentiment about;" or, in other words, it was the form of government which has to be set up when nothing else offers, and it was set up, just as the Orleanist monarchy was set up, and as the Republic of 1848 was set up, and as the Empire was set up, by a *coup d'état*. Whether the legislature of a country be set upon and turned out of doors by the general of the army, or by a mob rushing in from the street, makes, as far as the effect on the political education of the people goes, little difference. A

nation which has once grown accustomed to seeing governments it has organized, voted for, and obeyed destroyed in this way, as the French nation has, has fallen into a slough from which nothing but a long course of training or a special interposition of Providence can extricate it.

It is always dangerous as well as presumptuous to attempt much in the way of political prediction; but the outlines of the situation in France are so strongly traced that almost anybody can follow them without much speculation. If anything can be safely deduced from a nation's history or character, we may safely conclude that, whatever government makes peace with the Prussians, whether on Bismarck's terms or Favre's, is sure to be overthrown with ignominy, and become an object of great odium and ridicule. The Constituent Assembly will be composed, as the last was, very largely of conservatives sent on by the peasantry and landed proprietors and priests to look after the interests of property and religion. They will draw up a constitution which will be, perforce, republican in form, but they will not dare to leave the government or property in the great towns at the mercy of the Reds; and the Reds, in the period succeeding the war, will probably be unusually violent and threatening. Nor will they venture to treat the terrible wounds inflicted on the national pride by the war either as irreparable or of small consequence. The Republic will consequently either be saddled as before with a strong executive officer at the head of a large standing army, or will, as a defence against another *coup d'état*, commit the executive power to a commission of the legislature, an arrangement which will make the general in command of the army inevitably very formidable and the army difficult to manage; for nothing would irritate the French army more than to feel that it was in the hands of a small coterie of civilians, and it would probably rally round any chief who promised it deliverance from what it would regard as a humiliating and ridiculous situation. If he then began to intrigue on behalf of himself, or on behalf of the Orleans princes, or on behalf of something else than the Republic, and at last got into open collision with the legislature, it would be what experience justifies us in expecting. If, too, the Reds, disgusted with what they would very naturally regard as a sham Republic, should indulge in violence both of speech and behavior for the express purpose of driving the authorities into a recourse to military measures, and should at last succeed in causing the disappearance or violation of most of the constitutional provisions for the protection of individual rights, it would also be what experience warrants us in expecting. In short, there is nothing which our observation justifies us less in expecting than that a few devoted and enthusiastic men in Paris can, by willing a Republic, make one. Of course it may be said that by pretending to believe it possible we help to make it possible. But, for our own part, we believe that all real reforms in the world must rest on the sober recognition of the facts of life, and that he is, the worst enemy of the French, as of all, who helps people in the practice of any of the pleasing little games in which so many of our progressive men try to forget the hard, stern work of the world.

THE FUNDING BILL AND THE RATE OF INTEREST.

THE persistent and indefatigable Secretary of the Treasury has given notice that he is about to give notice that he will shortly be prepared to receive subscriptions to the new national loan into which he proposes to fund the existing six per cent. bonds of the United States. As this elaborate preliminary announcement of some probable future act, which may without discredit be left undone, looks somewhat like a mere attempt to feel the financial pulse, we might, after the repeated consideration bestowed in these columns upon Mr. Boutwell and his funding schemes, be excused for awaiting in silence the result of this disguised enquiry, were it not that the interest excited by other recent national loans—an illustration of which will be found among our correspondence to-day—tends to throw entirely new light upon the prospects of our own Treasury in its attempts to reduce the rate of interest upon the national debt.

Under the act of July 14, 1870, which Mr. Boutwell pressed through both branches of Congress with such feverish anxiety and at

so great a sacrifice of official dignity that every one was justified in looking long since for the announcement of its complete success, he is authorized to issue in all \$1,500,000,000 of new bonds: \$200,000,000 at 5 per cent., \$500,000,000 at 4½ per cent., and \$1,000,000,000 at 4 per cent. He is not allowed to sell any portion of these bonds for less than par in gold, but he may exchange them, bond for bond, for other United States bonds bearing 6 per cent. interest. It is evident from Mr. Boutwell's notice of his intention to give notice that he expects either to make sales or else to have bonds presented for exchange. It is equally evident that, under the terms of the act, he will have a better prospect of selling or exchanging the 5 per cent. bonds than those bearing a less rate of interest. If, therefore, it should be found that the prospect of selling or exchanging the 5 per cent. bonds is a very slight one, it would not be necessary to dwell upon the prospect for the 4 and 4½ per cent. bonds.

The 5 per cent. bonds now out, known as ten-forties, and in no essential particular different from the proposed new issue, sold in this market on Saturday, October 22, at 106¼ in currency, or, at the then ruling premium of 113 for gold, equal to 95 in gold, or just five per cent. below par. On these bonds there had then accumulated one and three-quarters months' interest, or precisely three-quarters of one per cent. in gold. Deducting this accumulated interest, American buyers were willing to give just 94¼ for the 5 per cent. bonds then in circulation. Why in all the world should Mr. Boutwell expect that American buyers should give him 5½ per cent. more for his new bonds than they can buy precisely similar old bonds for, without the annoyance, risk, delay, and red-tapeism of a Treasury bargain? The general belief among the honest supporters of a funding scheme seems to be, that with the decline in gold by some mysterious process the value of the bonds will advance, until our domestic investors will be willing to pay par and even more for a 5 per cent. bond. But it is very clear that the decline in gold every day reduces the currency income received from all gold-bearing securities, and to that extent lessens their value as an investment. The decline in gold, even if it continues, will not therefore necessarily advance the market value of bonds for home investment. It is very true that heretofore, that is to say, within the last two years, an average decline of twenty per cent. in gold has not been accompanied by a corresponding decline in the currency price of bonds; but this firmness has not been due to the domestic demand for them, it has, on the contrary, been accompanied by a steady selling-out on the part of American holders, who have, wisely or unwisely, preferred to buy railroad and other mortgage securities, which yield, or are promised to yield, a much higher rate of annual interest. The exchange of Government bonds for railroad and other securities continues up to the present moment without interruption, and unless some very startling event should supervene to destroy confidence in this class of investments, any further decline in gold would only tend to increase it. It is not at all likely, therefore, that the expected decline in gold will advance the price of our bonds through any purchases by American investors.

The reason why, in spite of the decline in gold, and in spite of the steady selling by domestic holders, American bonds have failed to decline, is simply that they have been bought by foreign investors; and the question immediately arises, will foreign investors continue to buy—will they buy in sufficient quantities to maintain the price—will they buy enough to advance the price to a point where Mr. Boutwell can sell his new four, four and a half, or five per cent. bonds at par? It is on this point that the recent experience of Europe and the probable immediate future seem to throw enough new light to warrant a recurrence to this threadbare topic.

We have more than once referred to the recent loan of the North-German Confederation, of which a correspondent gives us the only trustworthy account we have so far met with. This loan for a limited amount, offered by the Government in the midst of most marvellous military successes, while money in the principal financial centre was a drug at two or three per cent. per annum, was a comparative failure. A five per cent. bond, for which Mr. Boutwell expects to get par, was offered at 88, twelve per cent. below par, and of 125,000,000 offered, only 80,000,000 were subscribed. It is true that the unsubscribed balance

was entirely withdrawn from the market, and that the bonds actually issued have since advanced from 88, the issuing price, to 94 or 94½, or precisely the same figure at which American bonds are quoted that bear the same rate of interest. But the fact remains that the five per cent. bonds of the nation which holds by far the largest amount of our securities, and whose credit can in no sense be considered inferior to our own, are not readily taken *at home* at five or six per cent. below par. Why should we expect the same people to take ours at par and over? Would peace, if declared to-morrow, alter this state of affairs? Scarcely any thinking person doubts that peace would almost immediately bring France, as well as every German state, into the markets of the world as borrowers. Would this additional competition improve the demand for our bonds? The competition of governments is not even the only competition to be considered. Since the breaking out of the war, the idle transferable capital of both Germany and France has been added in large amounts to the idle capital of England, swelling the coin reserve of the Bank of England to almost unprecedented figures, and reducing the interest rate for money in London to a merely nominal one. A considerable portion of this idle capital is reported to have been temporarily invested in American securities, thereby helping to maintain the price under the sales of both German and American investors. Peace will not only restore this idle capital to its former owners or employers, but will create a demand for further amounts of English capital, to be employed in repairing the waste and destruction of war. Who does not remember how, from 1865 on, and to this present day, the capital of the world has been pouring into our country to replace what we had destroyed? Something similar, though less in degree, will no doubt take place in France after peace, and to some extent even in Germany. The capital of all nations will be in a measure drawn upon to repair *their* waste. While thus the individuals of two great nations are likely to compete with their own governments for the idle capital of the world, it would be palpably unreasonable to expect a decline in the ruling rates of interest in the European money-markets. And if, at the extremely low rates of interest recently prevailing, bonds as good as our own could not be sold in the home market better than 94, or six per cent. less than par, it does not seem sound reasoning to expect that ours will advance to par, as *interest becomes higher and money scarcer*. And again, if there is little probability of Mr. Boutwell getting par for his \$200,000,000 of five per cents., how much probability is there of his getting par for his \$300,000,000 of four and a half per cents., or his \$1,000,000,000 of four per cents?

"Banks and responsible bankers will be designated for the negotiation of the loan, and paid a commission upon the amounts negotiated by them respectively." There may lie hidden in this clause, or in some other part of Mr. Boutwell's programme, a charm of potent virtue to stimulate the foreign or domestic banking interest to overcome the laws of trade and finance. But to the insight of all ordinary financial observers, Mr. Boutwell's resumption of his funding scheme at this moment is only one more illustration of his complete inability to recognize the essential fact: that the finances of any one great nation cannot be administered successfully without some regard to the financial situation of other nations of equal rank. Congress or the Secretary of the Treasury may decide upon the rate of interest they would *like* to pay. But the rate they will be *obliged* to pay is not settled by them, but rather by a silent and unconscious congress of other nations, whose verdict is not announced in "notices of an intention to give notice," but is quietly recorded upon the price-lists of two or three stock exchanges. Unless we much misread the signs, that record is likely to be that some time must yet elapse before we can hope to refund our debt at 4, 4½, or even 5 per cent.

THE COMPARATIVE MORALITY OF NATIONS.

WE had, four or five weeks ago, a few words of controversy with the *Christian Union* as to the comparative morality of the Prussians and Americans, or, rather, their comparative religiousness—meaning by religiousness a disposition "to serve others and live as in God's sight;" in other words, unselfishness and spirituality. We let it drop, from the feeling that the question whether the Americans or Prussians were the better men was only a part, and a very small part, of the larger question, How do we

discover which of any two nations is the purer in its life or in its aims, and is not any judgment we form about it likely to be very defective, owing to the inevitable incompleteness of our premises? We are not now going to try to fix the place of either Prussia or the United States in the scale of morality, but to point out some reasons why all comparisons between them should be made by Americans with exceeding care and exceeding humility. There is hardly any field of enquiry in which even the best-informed man is likely to fall into so many errors: first, because there is no field in which the vision is so much affected by prejudices of education and custom; and, secondly, because there is none in which the things we see are so likely to create erroneous impressions about the things we do not see. But we may add that it is a field which no intelligent and sensible man ever explores without finding his charity immensely stimulated.

Let us give some illustrations of the errors into which people are apt to fall in it. Count Gasparin, who is a French Protestant, and as spiritually-minded a man as breathes, once talking with an American friend, expressed in strong terms his sense of the pain it caused him that Mr. Lincoln should have been at the theatre when he was killed, not, the friend found, because he objected in the least to theatre-going, but because it was the evening of Good Friday—a day which the Continental Calvinists "keep" with great solemnity, but to which American non-episcopal Protestants pay no attention whatever. Count Gasparin, on the other hand, would have no hesitation in taking a ride on Sunday, or going to a public promenade after church hours, and, from seeing him there, his American friend would draw deductions just as unfavorable to the Count's religious character as the Count himself drew with regard to Mr. Lincoln's.

Take, again, the question of drinking beer and wine. There is a large body of very excellent men in America who, from a long contemplation of the evils wrought by excessive indulgence in intoxicating drinks, have worked themselves up to a state of mind about all use of such drinks which is really discreditable to reasonable beings, and leads to the most outrageous platform excesses, and, we are sorry to say, to considerable unscrupulousness of speech, and is perfectly incomprehensible to Continental Europeans. To the former, the drinking even of lager beer connotes, as the logicians say, ever so many other vices—grossness and sensuality of nature, extravagance, indifference to home pleasures and repugnance to steady industry, and a disregard of the precepts of religion and morality. To many of them a German workman, and his wife and children, sitting in a beer-garden on a summer's evening, which to European moralists and economists is one of the most pleasing sights in the world, is a revolting spectacle, which calls for the interference of the police. Now, if you go to a beer-garden in Berlin you may, any Sunday afternoon, see doctors of divinity—none of your rationalists—but doctors of real divinity, to whom American theologians go to be taught, doing this very thing, and, what is worse, smoking pipes. An American who applied to this the same course of reasoning which he would apply to a similar scene in America, would simply be guilty of outrageous folly. If he argued from it that the German doctor was selfish, or did not "live as in the sight of God," the whole process would be a model of absurdity.

Foreigners have drawn, on the other hand, from the American "diligence in business," conclusions with regard to American character far more uncomplimentary than those the *Christian Union* has expressed with regard to the Prussians. There are not a few religious and moral and cultivated circles in Europe in which the suggestion that Americans, as a nation, were characterized by thoughtfulness for others and a sense of God's presence would be received with derisive laughter, owing to the application to the phenomena of American society of the process of reasoning on which, we fear, the *Union* relies. Down to the war, so candid and perspicacious a man as John Stuart Mill might have been included in this class. The earlier editions of his "Elements of Political Economy" contained a contemptuous statement that one sex in America was entirely given up to "dollar-hunting" and the other to "breeding dollar-hunters." In other words, he held that the American people were plunged in the grossest materialism, and he doubtless based this opinion on that intense application of the men to commercial and industrial pursuits which we see all around us, which no church finds fault with, but which we know, bad as its effects are on art and literature, really coexists with great generosity, sympathy, public spirit, and ideality.

Take, again, the matter of chastity, on which the *Union* touched. We grant, at the outset, that wherever you have classes, the women of the lower class suffer more or less from the men of the upper class, and anybody who says that seductions, accomplished through the effect on female

vanity of the addresses of "superiors in station," while almost unknown here, are very numerous in Europe, would find plenty of facts to support him. But, on the other hand, an attempt made to persuade a Frenchman that the familiar intercourse which the young people of both sexes in this country enjoy was generally pure, would fail in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. That it should be pure is opposed to all his experience of human nature, both male and female; and the result of your argument with him would be that he would conclude either that you were an extraordinarily simple person, or took him for one. On the other hand, we believe the German, who thinks nothing of drinking as much wine or beer as he cares for, draws from the conduct of the American young women whom he sees abroad, and from what he reads in our papers about "free love," Indiana divorces, abortion, and what not, conclusions with regard to American chastity very different from the *Union*; and, if you sought to meet him in discussion, would overwhelm you with facts and cases which, looked at apart from the general tenor of American life and manners, it would be very hard to dispose of. He would say, for instance, that we are not, perhaps, guilty of as many violations of the marriage vow as Europeans; but that we make it so light a vow that, instead of violating it, we get it abrogated, and then follow our will; and then he would come down on us with boarding-house and hotel life, and other things of the same kind, which might make us despise him, but would make it a little difficult to get rid of him.

There is probably no minor point of manners which does more to create unfavorable impressions of Europeans among the best class of Americans—morally the best, we mean—than the importance attached by the former to their eating and drinking; while there is nothing which does more to spread in Europe impressions unfavorable to American civilization than the indifference of Americans, and, we may add, as regards the progressive portion of American society—cultivated indifference—to the quality of their meals and the time of eating them. In no European country is moderate enjoyment of the pleasures of the table considered incompatible with high moral aims or even a sincerely religious character; but a man to whom his dinner was of serious importance would find his position in an assembly of American reformers very precarious. The German or Frenchman or Englishman, indeed, treats a man's views of food, and his disposition or indisposition to eat it in company with his fellows, as an indication of his place in civilization. Savages love to eat alone, and it has been observed, in partially civilized communities relapsing into barbarism, that one of the first indications of their decline was the abandonment of regular meals on tables, and a tendency on the part of individuals to retire to secret places with their victuals—probably a remnant of the old aboriginal instinct which we still see in domesticated dogs, and which was, doubtless, implanted for the protection of the species in times when everybody looked on his neighbor's bone with a hungry eye, and the man with the strong hand was apt to have the fullest stomach. Accordingly, there is in Europe, and indeed everywhere, a tendency to regard the growth of a delicacy in eating, and close attention to the time and manner of serving meals and their cookery, and the use of them as promoters of social intercourse, as an indication of moral as well as material progress. To a large number of people here, on the other hand, the bolting of food—ten-minute dinners, for instance—and general unconsciousness of "what is on the table," is a sign of preoccupation with serious things. It may be; but the German love of food is not necessarily a sign of grossness, and that "overfed" appearance, of which the *Union* spoke, is not necessarily a sign of inefficiency any more than leanness or cadaverousness is a sign of efficiency. There is certainly some power of hard work in King William's army, and, indeed, we could hardly point to a better illustration of the truth, that all the affairs of men, whether political, social, or religious, depend for their condition largely on the state of the digestion.

Honesty, by which we mean that class of virtues which Cicero includes in the term *bona fides*, has, to a considerable extent, owing, we think, to the peculiar humanitarian character which the circumstances of the country have given to the work of reform, been subordinated in the United States to brotherly kindness. Now, this right to arrange the virtues according to a scale of its own is something which not only every age but every nation has claimed, and, accordingly, we find that each community, in forming its judgment of a man's character, gives a different degree of weight to different features of it. Keeping a mistress would probably, anywhere in the United States, damage a man's reputation far more seriously than fraudulent bankruptcy; while horse-stealing, which in New England would be a comparatively trifling offence, out in Montana is a far fouler thing than murder. But in the European scale, honesty still occu-

pies the first place. Bearing this in mind, it is worth any man's while who proposes to pass judgment on the morality of any foreign country to consider what is the impression produced on foreign opinion about American morality by the story of the Erie Railroad, by the career of Fisk, by the condition of the judicial bench in the commercial capital of the country, by the charges of corruption brought against such men as Trumbull and Fessenden at the time of the impeachment trial; and by the comically prominent and beloved position which Butler has held for some years in our best moral circles, and by the appointment of such a man as Sickles as a national representative, and by the condition of the civil service.

The truth is that it is almost impossible for anybody to compare one nation with another fairly, unless he possesses complete familiarity with the national life of both, and therefore can distinguish isolated facts from symptomatic facts. The reason why some of the phenomena of American society which shock foreigners greatly do not shock even the best Americans so much, is not that the latter have become hardened to them—though this counts for something—but that they know of various counteracting and compensating phenomena which prevent, and are sure to prevent, them in the long run from doing the mischief they seem to threaten. In other words, they understand the checks and balances of their society as well as its tendencies. Anybody who considers these things will be careful how he denounces people whose manners differ from his own for want of spirituality or morality, and we may add that any historical student engaged in comparing the morality of the age in which he lives with that of any other age which he knows only through chronicles, will do well to exercise the same caution for the same reasons.

WHAT CITIZEN-SOLDIERS MAY DO FOR FRANCE.

NEAR TOURS, October 8, 1870.

SLIGHT as it may be, there is an undoubted change for the better; faint as it is, there is the possibility of a ray of hope. There is this possibility, because, through the most frightful misfortunes that have ever crushed a nation in modern times, the situation of France seems likely to become a true instead of a false one.

I must explain. So long as France was fighting for institutions and ideas of the past, the situation was a false one; as false as it would have been if the ghosts of the volunteers of 1792 had risen from their graves to fight with an Austrian army against Italian freedom. So long as France fought thus, she was doomed, for her German adversary represented a higher and more forward state of civilization than she did.

Now, it was not merely the fact of fighting for the maintenance of Imperial despotism which condemned France to retrogradism and therefore to defeat. It was something worse, even, and more radically false than this: it was the belief in the *professional* soldier, in the hired butcher set apart, fed, and fattened for the sole purposes of dynastic massacre—the most hideous of all remnants of the dark ages in this our age of light. Unable to understand the pure national power which, armed for the right, struggled on through four years to ultimate and inevitable victory in the United States; convinced that the German element of weakness would be found in that which constitutes its strength—in its all but countless regiments of armed citizens—France relied on the professional cut-throat, and fell. She believed to the very hour of her disgrace that the honor of a country can be surely defended by those who are either more or less than men—tyrants or slaves, as the case may be, never plain, honest men—and, leaning on this utterly obsolete creed, she gave way.

But there is a higher, fuller national life in France than this, and if that is developed in her to its utmost she may yet be saved. Now, at the present hour, and not at Reichshofen or Sedan, is the crisis of her fate. If she can rise to the level of our time, if she can once discard the fictions of the past, and learn that by their worth are nations powerful, and that no worth is above that of a duty-loving, true man—that right is always easy to uphold, and that standing armies are only needful to support possible wrong—if France can learn this, she will eventually drive the Germans from her soil.

Herein lies the truth of the situation of this country; and if I have ventured to speak of a ray of hope, however faint, it is because I think I see certain signs of a proper apprehension of things as they really are in the French. There are many in Tours who, thank God! agree with me in all this, and circumstances seem to be forcing on all the creed which is that of our age. Wherever the mere professional soldier appears in this war, he is beaten—not merely beaten, but panic-stricken, and he flies in abject terror. There is no worth in the man, for the plain reason that he is not a man, but an instrument, a machine. Not all the preaching or scolding

or shooting of General Trochu, or any other general, will infuse the requisite ardor into these wretched linesmen or Zouaves; they have no worth—they must go—they are of the past; and in their place must rise up the citizen soldier, the man of this our time; the man who, for defending what he defends—his home, his loved ones, his right to live in freedom and peace—is more a man, a man in a higher and better sense than before.

Now, as I said, there are certain signs—faint and far between as yet—that this is in progress; and when it becomes the general condition of things, France will be saved, for France will then be stronger than Germany. The moment that to the million of armed men of Germany France opposes the two or three (or, for that matter, four) millions of French citizens, fighting to defend their liberty and their homes, France becomes invincible; because, if she gets rid of her belief in professional butchers, she represents a larger amount of liberalism than does Germany; and Germany knows it. Politically and socially, all Germany (and even Prussia) is still shackled by feudal customs and distinctions, whereas, if France resolves to deserve, she is in advance of the whole of Europe. Her weakness has been her readiness to let slip the radical gains of the Revolution of '89. Having secured equal rights and a relative degree of freedom, she allowed military glory to dazzle her, and utterly lost sight of the fact that the worth and power of a nation depend on the worth of its individual sons. The present lesson is a severe one, but perhaps nothing less would have sufficed; and if this lesson is duly learnt by the French, no price can be esteemed too high for it.

I have said that everywhere the beaten armies have proved worthless; but there are signs that the young citizen troops may not be so. Such a revolution as France is now going through must needs proceed slowly, and step by step. Well, the steps taken hitherto are favorable to the energetic, though it may be inexperienced, defenders of the soil. At the first sortie made by the garrison of Paris the Zouaves ran away like scared rabbits, whilst the Mobile Guard stood its ground manfully, and, when forced by the panic of the professional soldiers to retreat, retreated in good order. Since then, on every occasion where the armed civilian has been called into action, he has done his duty, and on more than one occasion has succeeded in routing the enemy. Three days ago, the dislodging of the Prussians from several small points occupied by them in the neighborhood of Orléans was again the work of the Garde Mobile, and, in truth, this is the first *serious* success of the second campaign. On the other hand, the correspondents of the London *Times* all record the mischief done on the line of the Vosges mountains by the local free-shooters; and throughout the north and northeastern parts of France you may now hear of Francs-tireurs having managed to intercept provision-wagons or repulse reconnoitring detachments. All this, you will say, is very little when compared to the tremendous gains of an army that has swept away in forty days the entire army of Imperial France. So it is; but I set out by saying that the possibility of hope was the very smallest in the world, and it must also be remembered that Imperial France is what has been ruined (and most righteously so), and that what is now attempting the gigantic work of salvation is Republican France. It is not because here and there a few skirmishes have within the last week ended favorably for the French that even the faintest ray of hope is allowable; it is because each of these miniature successes has been achieved by the pure democratic element, by the citizen armed for the defence of his home, and not by the professional soldier—by the slavish instrument whose monstrous trade it is to fight, and do nothing save fight. Let there be time for the nation to rise here and resolve upon resistance, and the Germans may yet be expelled, for they have this time the disadvantage of being the aggressors, and more than one respected and honored voice in Germany is raised to remind them energetically of this.

There can be no doubt that since Count Bismarck refused the offers of peace made to him by Jules Favre, he has morally changed the relative positions of the two countries, and taken upon himself a responsibility almost as heavy as that assumed by Louis Napoleon in the month of July. When the King of Prussia agreed to the abandonment of the claim of Prince Hohenzollern to the Spanish throne, war need never have broken out; and by forcing it on, Louis Napoleon committed the most heinous crime that modern history chronicles. He committed it for purely selfish, dynastic (and, probably, pecuniary) ends. He paid for his guilt. When the destruction of the entire French army, and the annihilation of the shameful and dangerous Empire, had made France harmless for aggressive purposes, and when the men at the head of the new Government frankly avowed the wrong she had been made to share, and courageously said she

must bear the penalty of it, then peace might have been made, the war need no longer have gone on, it might have been quickly and most honorably ended for both sides. And by determining upon its continuance, Count Bismarck and his master have committed an undoubted wrong, sacrificing, as did Louis Napoleon, what was just and right and Christian for dynastic and selfish ends—for the mere lust of conquest.

To succeed rapidly and completely becomes, therefore, now as great a necessity for Count Bismarck as it was for Louis Napoleon when he unjustifiably declared war upon Prussia. If the German armies, having now assumed the part of aggression, can enter Paris quickly without paying very dearly for this satisfaction, such bystanders as have no rule for their judgments save success will say Count Bismarck was right in rejecting peace, and that in so doing he "knew what he was about;" in this case, he can inflict his own terms, leave France resolved to seize the first opportunity for making war anew, and disperse to the winds all and any notion of disarmament in Europe. But if the French *nation* rallies—if by the virtue of republicanism men, money, and arms are forthcoming throughout the land, and the prolonged resistance of Paris forces the Germans to pay a very high price for entering it, that price will probably be voted too high, and the terms of peace will be modified by the invaders. It must not be forgotten that Germany has obtained already all, and more than all, she wished for; she has secured her absolute unity; she may be "the empire" once more if she chooses, or a federation, or whatever she likes best; she is utterly her own mistress, and becomes, without doubt, the strongest power in Europe. Nor must it be forgotten how just and reasonable a people are the Germans generally, how devoid of mere glory-hunting tendencies.

If, then, I say again, there is such a genuine upheaving of the national spirit in France as to oppose to the invading (and now aggressive) Germans an armed and determined *nation*, the Germans will have to retire. In that case, they will have to do so because they themselves will admit that the price to be paid for Paris is too dear, and because a really strong republic will always be stronger than any monarchy.

Correspondence.

THE PRUSSIAN WAR LOAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* of the 8th instant, amongst other most valuable and excellently written articles, contains the one headed "Prussian War Loans." (This expression is not quite correct, for it is the loan of the North-German Confederation.) This article, written evidently with some very good knowledge of financial matters in general and of Prussian financial affairs in particular, is only to some extent correct in its arguing and trying to prove the loan an utter failure. Pardon, therefore, my endeavor to correct some misstatements which, in my opinion, led the financial writer of the *Nation* into some errors.

1. I cannot call the not taking up of the loan in full a "total failure," since of the 125 millions only about 80 were offered to the public, and actually a subscription of about 66 millions took place.

2. The insufficient taking up of the loan cannot be considered a "surprise," since, although the commencement of the article speaks of the *favorable terms* of the loan, yet in the further arguments, and more particularly by comparison with the then quotation of the 6 per cent. American bonds, it proves that the terms were by no means favorable—the issuing price of the loan being 83 per cent. and the 5 per cent. Prussian stocks being down as low as 82 per cent. And to this reason, chiefly, I attribute the failure (though not *utter* one) of the subscription.

Besides this, it was a mistake on the part of the Treasury to make Berlin the chief subscribing place, for though one might subscribe at any other place of the Northern Confederation, he was charged with the cost of transmission, chiefly postage to and fro, on the amount paid up as, or deposited for, security—and in Prussia the charge is rather heavy for registered money-letters—and other accumulating costs, which amounted in all to about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., thus lessening the "favorable terms." Had this mistake not been made, a good many smaller cities would have participated in the subscription, for there is more "idle money" (one of the three sources spoken of) in these small towns than at the capital or the chief provincial cities. At places where "exchanges" exist, every penny of idle money is immediately invested, either in speculation or for interest, which the minor places have less chance to avail themselves of.

I doubt whether the loan would have been more successful if Prussia

had opened the subscription at foreign markets also, or if Prussian stocks had had a quotation at places out of her own borders. Had this latter been the case, Prussia would have been obliged to take up a large amount of returned stocks, and I think Prussia was saved a good deal of financial embarrassment by her stocks not being in foreign markets. In proof of this, take the return to France, chiefly from England, of an immense amount of French "rentes" at the time of issuing the new French loan, causing a depression of at least 3 per cent., or rather 3 in 65.

It is stated that the true nature of the negotiation has not transpired. Begging your pardon, it has, and the statement of the correspondent of the New York *Tribune*, telegraphed on the 18th of August, that 40 millions were sold at 63, is not only incredible, but decidedly incorrect, to use no stronger phrase. For it is well known here (and every banker at this place will affirm it) that 80 millions only were offered for subscription; that 66 millions were actually subscribed for; that the remaining 14 millions were taken up by the Seehandlung at above 88 per cent. (not 63), and that the unissued 45 millions are up to this moment not even brought into the market. An application of a party of Berlin bankers (Mr. Bleichröder, agent for Rothschilds, at the head of it) to take those 45 millions at 94 per cent. was rejected, the Government stating that it wanted no more ready cash at present.

By the bye, the Seehandlung, of which the article speaks rather disparagingly, stating the establishment to have dwindled down from the position of a "Matschapey" or East India Company to a Crédit Mobilier or Crédit Foncier, is no more than a financial agent of the Government, like any other banking establishment. Those two French Imperial institutions, which are mostly answerable for the financial ruin of France, have ruined through their swindling transactions (benefiting only the Péreires, Mornys, and a few others) thousands of French families. The Seehandlung could never take up, with a capital stock of 12 millions only, a subscription of 60-70 millions without being looked upon as a swindling establishment. For with a loss of 20 per cent. only on so heavy a sum—and in war-times such a loss is easily possible and would have been quite certain had Germany been less successful in repulsing the shameful French attack—the establishment would have been ruined. Calling such a transaction a mere blind to hide the Treasury defeat is an ill-chosen accusation against the establishment as well as against the Government, for, thank heaven, in Prussia financial matters are all so much above-board that such illegal proceedings could not well be hidden, since the Government as well as the Seehandlung are responsible for their respective budgets to the legislature of the country. It has hardly been heard of that transactions of a cloudy nature were ever entered into by Prussian ministers with their subaltern officials, and such are the directors and board of administration of the Seehandlung.

Finally, I believe the failure of the subscription is chiefly to be attributed to the high price at which it was issued, as is easily proved by comparison with the price of American 6 per cent. bonds then made, viz., 80 per cent.

\$1,000 6 per cent. at 80 per cent. or at 15-12 R. Th. — R. Th. 1133.10, giving at 6 per cent. R. Th. 85 interest.

R. Th. 1,000 5 per cent. at 88 per cent. — R. Th. 880, giving at 5 per cent. R. Th. 50 interest.

Capital has neither conscience nor patriotism, and it is, therefore, not to be wondered at that a good many people rather held their American 6 per cent. bonds (not to speak of the difference in the security between a bond of a state that enjoys peace and a loan issued by a Government that stands before a struggle of such magnitude as a war between Germany and France) than sell and exchange them for a dearer 5 per cent. war loan. And the proof of this financial pudding is in the eating. Let me invite you to the dinner to-day, at 12 o'clock, at the Berlin exchange:

1,000 R. Th. at 96 — R. Th. 960, against R. Th. 880, as above;
\$1,000 at 95 — \$950, R. Th. 1345.25, against R. Th. 1133.10, as above,

besides the difference of 1 per cent. per annum interest. On about 700 million dollars invested in American bonds in Germany, the difference of profit amounts in these few weeks to more than one-half of the whole war loan.

I think I have proved the contrary to the "surprise" of the *Nation*, and, in my opinion, it would have been a surprise if the loan had been taken up in full or subscribed for above the sum total. It was not cheap enough, and German capitalists know how to calculate; that is the reason of the failure. Patriotism has nothing to do with it.

R. W. & Co.

BERLIN, September 27, 1870.

[We take pleasure in making room for the foregoing communica-

tion, the signature to which will probably be recognized by many of our readers among business men as that of one of the leading banking-houses of Prussia. It is especially interesting to us as admitting in the main the fact at which we then expressed our surprise, viz.: that in spite of the marvellous war enthusiasm of Germany, a loan on favorable terms for a very small sum had been virtually a failure. With the imperfect knowledge of the facts then in our possession, many of which (like the *Tribune* telegram referred to by our correspondent and discredited by us at the time) have since proved to be untrustworthy, we sought to explain this remarkable anomaly. Our correspondent takes exception to our statement of the facts, and repudiates our explanation. With regard to the latter we must be permitted to adhere to our own opinions, which are not, indeed, controverted by R. W. & Co. But with regard to the former we are bound to accept our correspondent as an authority not to be questioned, and hence recommend his statement to our American readers as the only complete and trustworthy one which we have met with anywhere.

An interesting feature of our correspondent's letter is the unquestioning faith in American securities, the safety of which is, in this case certainly, as we have always claimed, admitted to surpass that of any loan offered by any European nation in times of war. But it is also noticeable that we should be warned, by the example of France and the anticipations of Prussia, of the fate likely to overtake our own finances in case of war here.

The indignant rejection of our qualified comparison of the Seehandlung with the Crédit Mobilier, and the emphatic defence of the Prussian Government against our implied charge of financial "manœuvring," is an illustration of the spirit of honesty which has repeatedly been recognized in these columns as the foundation of German successes. That the balance which the Seehandlung subscribed for, and which repeated and detailed telegrams clearly showed to be a very large one, was in reality, as our correspondent explains it, only a much smaller sum, alters somewhat the nature of the transaction which we condemned; but it does not seem to us to remove the reproach, that the Government became morally compelled to subscribe nominally to a large part of its own loan. However, the very idea "that the responsibility of a financial institution to the legislature of the country" is considered proof positive "that illegal proceedings could not well be hidden," raises us to such heights of financial purity that our own financial atmosphere seems doubly pestilential and miasmatic by comparison; and possibly even that remnant of reproach may be undeserved.

The most striking statement of the whole letter is this, that the profit from the advance of American bonds held in Germany during a few weeks was sufficient to pay more than one-half of the entire war loan. Query: Whose is the gain by this advance, and—whose is the loss?—ED. NATION.]

MR. WENDELL PHILLIPS'S "PHILOSOPHY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I read with pain, though without surprise, your recent articles entitled "Tertullian in the Amphitheatre," etc., in which you treat of Mr. Wendell Phillips and his school of political thinkers. Your remarks betray a failure on your part to appreciate the true functions of these philosophers—for philosophers, believe me, they are, your authority to the contrary notwithstanding. I speak with the more confidence on this point as I once thought of them as you do now; but they demonstrated their superior wisdom in a method I could not ignore.

Let me illustrate my meaning. In his speech in Boston, on the 18th inst., Mr. Phillips thus defines his past and future sphere of utility: "Into everything, it (the Republican party) has been forced by an outside criticism—every single step. . . . What are we doing to-day? Just what we have done for ten years: watering the Republican party to make it grow; pressing it in order to make it act; drawing off somewhere by some method a force that shall compel its recognition of the duty of the hour. . . . Well, gentlemen of the press, correspondents, and editors, I belong to a section of men whose example taught you about all you know as to political matters. . . . I intend to teach you a great deal more before I get through."

Holding myself to be "an advanced thinker," I pronounce every word

of this true, and find profit in my own individual experience. During the war of the rebellion, I was in the army. I saw no little service, and got some hard knocks. Then I had not attained the development of political thought which I hope I now have. I did my duty to the best of my ability, and fought the enemy before me. I almost laugh now as I recall my great but simple indignation, at that time, when Mr. Phillips, in opposing the re-election of President Lincoln, made his famous comparison between him (Lincoln) and a mud-turtle—coax him, drive him, turn him over; he only draws his head within his shell, and is impenetrable; if you want to make him move, put a live coal on his back. The Cleveland Convention was the "live coal," and Mr. Phillips applied it. At the time, the jeopardizing, in this way, all the results of the war made me very angry; from my position at the front, it seemed like a fire in the rear. I have, however, long seen how wrong I was, and how correctly Mr. Phillips judged. No one, I presume, will now deny that we owe the whole work of reconstruction to the Cleveland Convention.

Again, you doubtless remember Mr. Phillips's extreme ground in regard to Southern repression and confiscation. Here, too, he was right; again he was applying the "live coal" to the back of the mud-turtle. Our people were too generous, too good-natured, too merciful; I was myself, I know. Mr. Phillips took the extreme ground in order to force public opinion up to even a moderate degree of sternness, and the fruit of his labors is apparent to all in the present reliable and satisfactory Republican organization throughout the Southern States. This course was a painful one for Mr. Phillips, for he is always and ever a philanthropist—one who loves to bind up wounds and alleviate misfortune. How painful it was, you might, if you chose, form an idea from his recent utterances as regards Count Bismarck and France after the surrender of Sedan. There the philanthropist had full play, and the political teacher felt no duty incumbent upon him; his voice was loud and clear for mercy and humanity; he abhorred and denounced even a moderate exercise of the hard-won privileges of victory. The friend of men could afford a protest for prostrate France; the instructor of his countrymen had a duty to perform as regarded the conquered South; did he not, I ask you, perform it? Think you it was pleasant exacting that pound of flesh?

One point as regards Mr. Phillips has not been sufficiently dwelt upon; I wish now to do justice to it: I refer to his magnanimity. I do not think that even General Grant exceeds him in this respect. And the mention of Grant's name suggests an instance of the trait referred to in this very speech. You doubtless remember that Mr. Phillips was formerly bitterly opposed to the election of Grant; he opposed him politically, he opposed him morally. In a public speech, he referred to him as having been seen, on one important occasion, "drunk in the streets of Washington." No one will deny Mr. Phillips's devotion to the cause of temperance. The speech of last evening, from which I have quoted, was delivered by him as the candidate of the temperance party, and was largely devoted to that subject. If one thing could demand from Mr. Phillips a sterner sacrifice than another, it would be, under a sense of public duty, to place in the President's chair, as an example to all the land, a victim of intemperance. Here you see Mr. Phillips's magnanimity. In this Boston speech—made, mark you, as candidate of the Prohibition party, he frankly withdraws all his opposition to the President—he does more, he yields him a hearty support: "I care a great deal that Ulysses S. Grant shall be the next President of the United States." Is not this real magnanimity? The exponent of temperance, he yet recognizes in public servants other things more important than temperance. Overcome by the lofty policy, searching political reforms, elevated moral tone, and pure example of that Administration the selection of which he so bitterly opposed—unable to retract the painful charge which he evidently feels he had but too good occasion to advance—he yet silently ignores both his own past utterances and the principle of which he is the exponent, fairly vanquished by the lofty moral and political attitude of a great man.

Before, sir, you again exercise your wit at the expense of Mr. Phillips, ask yourself whether you could make the same frank confession of error to one as regards whom you had committed yourself by a censure equally harsh. Meanwhile, in a recent number of the *Nation*, you divided the class to which Mr. Phillips belongs into "the Caesarists and the Sentimentalists." I certainly am not a Caesarist, but you doubtless would set me down as

A SENTIMENTALIST.

Boston, October 19, 1870.

[We shall, perhaps, best dispose of the sophistries on which the above feeble production is based by stating the facts which our "Sentimentalist" tries so clumsily to manipulate.

Mr. Phillips has been "in politics" just nine years. During that time he has proposed one grand piece of tactics, which was brought out at the Cleveland Convention—that is, the division of the Republican party in the most critical period of the war, for the purpose of procuring a change of Presidents, or, in other words, of throwing the whole administrative machinery of the country into confusion. What the result of this would have been, the American public then guessed at with tolerable clearness. Their provisions have since been curiously verified by what is passing in France. We there see what a change of administration under the guns of a determined enemy means. Had we tried it, Mr. Phillips would, doubtless, have consoled us as his brother, Victor Hugo, consoles the French, by "scathing" the enemy with epigrams. He next opposed the election of Grant on the ground that he was a street drunkard; and when Senator Wilson bore testimony to Grant's sobriety, he replied that Wilson was a shocking example of the badness of the men whom Democratic institutions brought to the surface, and that his denial that Grant was a drunkard satisfied him (Phillips) that it was only too true. He now, two years later, calls savagely before a prohibitory audience for the re-election of this same Grant. Our "Sentimentalist" calls this "magnanimity," which it may be, but it is something besides. The one great contribution which Mr. Phillips has made to the philosophy of politics is, "that you should never forget or forgive at the polls." He has for six months been hawking this chunk of wisdom round the country, exhibiting it to admiring crowds and protesting that it is entirely his own work, which nobody ever doubted. But how can he expect even the most docile colored man to put much value on it, in the face of his own forgiving and forgetting in the case of the President, and his asking people at a temperance meeting to re-elect to the highest office in the country a man who has been seen drunk in the streets, and to whose sobriety Mr. Wilson has testified? It may be that there are Boston editors who have got their political training from Mr. Phillips; but if there are, they ought to give occasional *stances*, at which the public might be allowed to examine their bumps and specimens of their work. The later Phillips "ideas" run through the average brain of his editorial disciples, and would always be interesting at least as curiosities.—ED. NATION.]

SCHOLARS IN THE PRUSSIAN ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Allow me to send you a little contribution to your further answer to "A. T."

In the battle at Mars-la-Tour, Aug. 16, fell Dr. Jul. Brakelmann; and in the battle at Rézonville, Aug. 18, Paul Herlth, both estimable and esteemed contributors to the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, which is published in Berlin and ranks as high as any literary journal in Germany.

Brakelmann was lately in Paris, studying the Provençal and old French literature, and left Paris on July 17 in order to join his regiment. In 1866, he stood in the army of the Main under General Vogel von Falkenstein. He also was an occasional contributor of the *Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Herlth was in Goldberger's banking-house in Berlin correspondent for Italy and France. In his leisure hours he studied modern languages, and gradually mastered most European tongues. Sanskrit he had studied at the University of Breslau. His translation of Calderon's "Life a Dream" was played in Weimar with great success. His latest work was a translation of Longfellow's "Evangeline." For the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes* he furnished valuable reviews and articles on the literature of Sweden and Spain. He fought, 1864, in Schleswig, and, 1866, at Sadowa, where he was promoted to a lieutenantancy. The *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, of Oct. 8, contains an account from a member of the Sanitary Commission, wherein the writer mentions his meeting, on the chain-bridge between Corny and Novéaut (near Metz), "Dr. M., now professor of political law (Staatsrecht) in Halle, who closed his lectures and entered the army with his students."

In some German bookstore in New York they may, perhaps, have a catalogue of the University of Halle, where the full name could be found.

Yours, respectfully,

E. C. F. KRAUSS.

Boston, Oct. 22, 1870.

Notes.

LITERARY.

THE *American Law Review* has so raised the standard of law periodicals that new ones cannot expect to satisfy easily the profession. The remark is applicable to the *United States Jurist*, for example, which Messrs. W. H. & O. H. Morrison announce that they will publish on January 1, at Washington, as a monthly "devoted to the practical wants of the American bar." It will contain "articles on subjects of professional interest, discussions on law reform, a regular summary of legal intelligence, and reviews of the latest law books;" besides passing notes on Congressional legislation, a digest of decisions in the U. S. Courts, abstracts of changes made by acts of Congress, noteworthy decisions of State courts, leading English cases, etc., etc. Mr. James Schouler, author of a recent treatise on "Domestic Relations," is to be the editor. The first volume will be rendered attractive by a series of familiar letters on the "Lawyers of American History" from the pen of an experienced writer. In what way the subject will be treated is not stated, but a good many volumes might without difficulty be filled exclusively with sketches, more or less complete, of men who have stepped from the bar into politics and official position.—Mr. Henry Brooks Adams, it is understood, is to assume the editorship of the *North American Review* with the January number, the publishers being, as heretofore, Messrs. Fields, Osgood & Co. Mr. Adams has been appointed to the new chair of history at Harvard, so that the *Review* does not lose its immediate connection with the *Review*, while the *Review* will gain not a little, we may expect, from Mr. Adams's past attention to politics, and in general from those qualities which the descendants of John Adams have inherited in a marked degree, making them valuable allies and very uncomfortable adversaries.

—A glance at the contents of Mr. Edward McPherson's "Hand-book of Politics for 1870"—in reality for 1869 also—recalls attention from the great political changes which are taking place in Europe to those which this country has witnessed in the past two years. We have, to be sure, no month of September to compare with that which will be ever memorable for containing the overthrow of Napoleon III., the fall of the Pope's temporal power, and the recovery of Strasbourg by Germany. Our famous battle-months, perhaps as precious to the human race, were past when the Fortieth Congress opened its third session in December, 1868, and listened to the last annual message of President Johnson. Mr. McPherson's manual begins with naming the members of the Cabinet and then of Congress at the time mentioned—and it seems long since Mr. Seward was Secretary of State and Mr. Evarts Attorney-General, there have been so many Cabinet changes meantime! Then we have the action of Congress in burying repudiation and passing the Fifteenth Amendment; the members of Grant's Cabinet and of the Forty-first Congress; Grant's inaugural address, message on reconstruction, and various proclamations; then the progress and end of reconstruction; the votes by yeas and nays of State Legislatures on the Amendment; statistics of the Presidential election and of several State elections in 1869. The financial record embraces the measures proposed and adopted by Congress to increase the currency and fund the national debt, and to reform the revenue and revise the tariff, together with those declaratory resolutions which from time to time were deemed necessary, touching repudiation and inflation and the tariff, and other minor questions of policy. The judicial record contains decisions of the Supreme Court on some of the most important issues, also very diverse, that can arise in any country. Such were those in regard to the Legal Tender Act, the McCordle case, the right of colored men to hold office in Georgia, intermarriage of blacks and whites in the same State, the validity of contracts in Confederate money; the right of States to tax United States certificates of indebtedness and notes and United States National Banks, and the right of the United States to tax State banks; the validity of coin contracts, etc., etc. There is also a very valuable list of land subsidies from 1827 to 1870, and statement of the amount of public land still left to be given away or plundered; the national debt statements; the fortunes of female suffrage in Congress and Massachusetts; the new constitution of Illinois; and other documents of permanent interest, down to July of the present year. We cannot too much praise the industry and intelligence of the compiler, whose services, it should not be forgotten, are not rendered to one party at the expense of the other, but impartially to the whole people.

—It is rather late to notice a little guide-book published by the Messrs. Appleton, called "Skeleton Tours through England, Scotland, Ireland,

Wales, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, Poland, and Spain," of which Mr. Henry Winthrop Sargent is the editor. The design is a novel one, and is so well expressed by the remainder of the title that we give it here: "with various ways of getting from place to place, the time occupied, and the cost of each journey to a party of four; with some of the principal things to see, especially country-houses." No better basis for a guide-book can be had than carefully-kept notes of actual travel, and these are what Mr. Sargent seems to have used, with good results. The attempt to compete with Murray or Baedeker in the grand tours would, of course, have been out of the question; but the editor having had the taste and good fortune in journeying to leave the beaten tracks, he has opened up fresh regions even for those who have "done" Europe till sated. This is especially true of England, where he and his party carried out a plan of visiting all the country places worth seeing, large or small, all the cathedrals, the university and school towns, and the various watering places and spas. We do not doubt that, as Mr. Sargent pretends, any one who follows the same course will see and know more of England than most Englishmen. The expenses, it ought to be stated, which are here reckoned, are lower *pro rata* than they would be for a single person travelling in the same way, by first-class conveyances and with every comfort of food and lodging, but still amount to from eight to ten dollars a day. The English tour, however, is precisely adapted to pedestrianism—in everything except the light in which a pedestrian is commonly regarded by English country people, to whom "the tramp" is apt to be the pedestrian type; and we trust that some who enjoy walking for its own sake, as well as those to whom it is a necessary economy, may be able to express their obligations to Mr. Sargent for directing their steps. For the sake of Americans who believe in knowing something of their own country before going abroad, as well as of foreigners who come over here, we may as well mention in this place "Appleton's Hand-book of American Travel," of which we have before us in a neat volume the Northern and Eastern Tour—from Canada to the Maryland line. One must not consult it for out-of-the-way places without being prepared for occasional disappointment; but it is nevertheless full, if not complete, and has evidently been carefully revised. For this reason, we call the editor's attention to two slight errors which we have observed in passing—the statue of Everett in the Boston Public Garden was not made by Powers, but by Story; and Bashbish Falls are not in Connecticut, as the index, apparently misled by Mr. Beecher, states, but belong either to New York or to Massachusetts, being nearly on the border line.

—While speaking of guide-books, we must not overlook Robert von Schlagintweit's brochure on the Pacific Railroad—"Die Pacific-Eisenbahn in Nordamerika" (New York; L. W. Schmidt). The author had the privilege of passing over the entire line on the day following the opening, and again subsequently, and having taken some pains to gather trustworthy statistics of the great enterprise, used them for a series of sketches in a German periodical. These he now by request republishes in their present form. The book, notwithstanding Herr Schlagintweit's scientific predilections, is a strictly practical one, and he half apologizes for mentioning that between Omaha and Platte City he took plaster casts of the heads of four Indian males and five squaws. But the story of how the road was built, and what one sees by the way, is anything but drily written, and an American especially will read with satisfaction the author's praise of American good-nature at railway-stations, of the absence of haste and worry in the depot at Omaha (so different, he says, from one's experience on German roads), the punctual start (wonderful!); the generous allowance in regard to baggage, the system of checks, the construction of the cars. He does not fail to note that these grow more comfortable the further West one gets; and in describing the Pullman sleeping-cars he does not omit the spittoons nor the colored attendant; and puts both the bell and the cow-catcher into his picture of the much-praised locomotive. The wood-cuts, by the way, are all from photographs, and give a fair idea of some of the chief features of the road and the country. There are numerous tables; showing the equivalence of English and German miles—as that 9 of the former equal nearly 2 of the latter, 60 nearly 13, 300 nearly 65, and 3,200 exactly 694; also the fares from all parts of the United States to San Francisco; the rate at which the two roads were built; the cost of freight; the stations and number of miles (both English and German) from New York to Omaha, and the same data, with elevation added, for the remainder of the route. At the end is a serviceable map of the road, with stations marked from Chicago to San Francisco. We do not know of any work in English that contains more information, more agreeably told, on the same subject.

—In explaining why we in this country cannot produce a comic paper, no hypothesis wears better (or, to borrow a slang phrase, "washes" better) than that our national humor is so diffused as to seek and to have a thousand channels for its expression, and that what thus becomes our daily food, as it were, in all our newspapers, cannot be served up as a delicacy in any one. This view is certainly supported by the number and diversity of our more prominent humorists; and it is worth observing that, with Artemus Ward only lately deceased, we should have as contemporaries Mark Twain, Nasby, Josh Billings, Bret Harte, Orpheus C. Kerr, and the irreverent and matchlessly impudent Town-Crier of the *News-Letter*, all writing actively, and each entirely distinct from the others—which may be said even of the three California humorists here mentioned. For sustained humor, independent of cacography, Mark Twain will probably be allowed the place that we have assigned him at random in the enumeration; and he is quite the antipodes of Josh Billings, who indulges in no prolonged efforts, who does have "bad spells," as he says, and whose humor finds vent in short aphorisms on all phases of human experience and conduct. His "Farmer's Allminax" last year was immensely successful, and that for 1870 is even better. Our English cousins have, we believe, taken kindly to Billings (whose real name, by the way, is Shaw), and we can recommend them to count his "Allminaxes" among their regular aids to digestion. To be sure, he is humorous on rather a low level, but he is seldom guilty of a *double entendre*, and often writes in what would be high style if expressed grammatically. His attentions to the mule are as persistent as they are droll, and almost constitute a distinguishing feature. Thus, in his "Housekeeper's Guide," he says: "To find the solid contents of a mule's hind legg, feel ov it clussly;" and of coons: "They want az much waiting on az a blind mule on a tow-path." And this might almost be offered as an addition to Christian evidences: "The man who wont beleave enny thing he kant see, aint so wize az a mule, for they will kick at a thing in the dark."

—The one figure in the French kaleidoscope whose change of position since the beginning of the summer has moved nobody to pity, is Émile Ollivier. He came into office inspiring the highest hopes in the friends of constitutional liberty, and seemed to hold in his hand the destiny of personal government. He kept his place long enough to develop the weakness of an easily flattered vanity, to make inexcusable and fatal mistakes of policy, to serve as the despised instrument of the Opposition, to share in bringing on his country the most humiliating war in all her history, and then fell, carrying with him the sympathy of no party and scarcely of any individual, and has passed into the obscurity of virtual exile, disregarded when not remembered with bitter reproaches. It is now stated on his behalf that he went to Italy to engage the Government to interfere to save France from her self-invoked fate, when his brother chanced to fall sick at Turin, and required his attentions. While thus occupied he heard of the proclamation of the Republic, which determined him not to return to France. He accordingly retired, upon his brother's recovery, to Pollone, near Biella, and there, as the guest of the Deputy Valerio, he is preparing a work in two volumes entitled "Mon Ministère du 2 Janvier." Volume one will discuss "le plébiscite;" volume two, "la guerre." As might have been supposed, Ollivier will undertake to prove that the war was provoked neither by France nor by Napoleon III., but by Prussia. That will be good reading after the capitulation of Paris, and about as instructive as Alexander H. Stephens's "Constitutional View of the Late War between the States."

—On the 1st of October an eminent Italian author, Luigi Cibrario, passed away both from political and from literary life. He was of humble origin, but died a senator, count, knight, minister of state, and fellow of the first academies in the world. He was born in Turin in 1802, became a doctor of laws at the age of twenty-two, and already had signalized his talent by several historical monographs when, in 1839, he acquired a European reputation by his "Political Economy in the Middle Ages," which ran through several Italian editions, and was translated into French and German. In 1840 appeared his "History of the Monarchy of Savoy," by which he is best known, and which was followed by a work on "Artillery from 1300 to 1700." In the midst of these graver studies, he found time, with extraordinary but truly Italian versatility, to write poetry and novels, and edited Petrarch's *Rime*. His history had won for him the attachment of Charles Albert, whose liberal innovations he discussed in a brochure entitled "Pensieri sulle Riforme di Carlo Alberto" in 1847. He assisted in the campaign which ended with Novara, and was deputed to visit the king at Oporto, after his abdication, in order to persuade him to return to Italy. This suggested the narrative known as "Ricordi di una

missione in Portogallo." The work which engaged his waning strength was worthy of his learning: "On Slavery and Serfdom" ("Della schiavitù e del servaggio").

—Under the signature of "Cantonensis," a writer holding, we understand, an official position under the British Government, furnished the late *Notes and Queries on China and Japan* with some curious details of the Chinaman's domestic expenses, which are worth reproducing for the bearing they have on the problem of Chinese labor in this country. It may be well to state as a preliminary that three monetary denominations exist in China: the *tael*, or ounce of silver, worth at par \$1 33⅓; the Mexican dollar (our U. S. dollars are rejected as containing too much alloy); and the *tien*, or "cash," of which nominally 1,000, but usually from 1,200 to 1,500, constitute the dollar. This infinitesimal coinage has obvious advantages in the facility it affords for the purchase of goods in small quantities. Its queer-looking appearance is familiar to most people, the thin casting being perforated by a square hole in the centre, through which strings of native grass or bamboo filaments are rove for convenience of carriage. The prevailing material is slightly alloyed copper; but iron, brass, and even clay, the two former pure, and the latter in combination with iron, have at times been used to serve as mediums of exchange. It having been stated that a Chinese beggar can sustain life on 30 *cash*, or but little over two cents, per diem, "Cantonensis" admits that lie can be, and frequently is, sustained for a considerable time on even a less sum by the wretched beings who form the pariah class of the Chinese population. He prefers, however, to place the average somewhat higher—say 90 cents per month for food and lodging—if lodging, indeed, it can be called. And this he estimates as the lowest sum upon which existence can be indefinitely prolonged. Ascending to the ordinary laborer, or "coolie" as we denominate him, food alone is estimated at from \$1 20 to \$2 per month. On the latter sum he would live sumptuously, and above the average style of his class. Upon one *tael* per month he would have a sufficiency of rice, fish, and vegetables; pork (the common meat of the poorer classes) once a day, and some of those little extras in the way of sauces, oils, etc., in which the Chinese palate especially delights. Upon one dollar per month he might for a time exist in a condition fit to labor, but would probably succumb before long to cutaneous or other diseases especially resulting from poorness of diet, combined with exposure and hard work. Amongst the better classes who are enabled to live comfortably, but without display, "Cantonensis" estimates the monthly expense for food to each individual at \$4 per month. These number in their ranks the lowest grade of officials, writers, and copyists in the public offices, doctors, etc.

—In the matter of rent, the Chinese enjoy superior advantages; for in no country in the world can a man live so cheaply in proportion to his means and position. If the laborer be married, he will probably share equally a house, having three rooms, with another similarly situated, at a total rental of \$2 per month. The cheapest domiciles for a single couple run as low as 840 *cash*, or about 70 cents, per month; and even these are, in many cases, shared by two or more families whose poverty compels them to put up with such straitened quarters. The remarkably pliable and contented disposition of the Chinese is herein strikingly exhibited, the utmost concord usually existing between the partners in these limited establishments. But then drunken husbands are almost unknown amongst our "debased" fellow-creatures on the other side of the Pacific. The class above alluded to as expending an average of \$4 a head per month for provisions, would generally occupy a house renting at from \$72 to \$96 per annum. Attendance is, of course, an item which falls only upon the well-to-do classes. The average rate of wages is from 60 cents to \$1 40 a month, in addition to food. Three servants form the ordinary establishment of a married man with children; and in this case two dollars per month is supposed to cover the expense of each. Sometimes, however, they are found in clothes, especially when engaged by mandarins. The total expenses of a Chinese laborer for self and wife may therefore be fixed at \$2 80 for food and \$1 for rent, making a monthly disbursement of \$3 80, irrespective of clothes. The lowest sum on which they could live and labor would be \$2 35 for food and rent. It is impossible to particularize the various grades between the common laborer and the lower "better class." But the expenses of the latter—say a man, wife, and three children—may be put at \$30 per month, thus divided: Rent, \$8; food for three servants, \$3; do. for parents, \$8; do. for three children, \$8; wages of servants, \$3; total, \$30. Cheap as are the prime necessities of life in China, the silly stories of Chinese want of nicety in devouring offal and garbage are devoid of foundation as they are ill-natured, none but the lowest beggars eating anything which would offend the fastidious palates of "Hans"

or "Patrick." In the matter of clothes, the Southern Chinaman is greatly favored by the climate, which permits him to dispense with any but the lightest upper garments. In the agricultural districts even the cotton jacket is seldom worn, the field laborers being naked from the waist. The average expenditure of a native in the rural districts does not amount to much over \$6 or \$7 per annum. With the richer classes, the scale of expenditure varies precisely as it varies here. Nothing is more untrue than the assertion, so frequently made, that Chinese fashions are unchangeable. The cut of his coat is as important in the eyes of a Chinese dandy as in those of his brother swell on Broadway; and it generally happens that Chinese clothing is, owing to the materials used by the "respectables"—silk in summer and valuable furs in winter—more expensive than the broadcloth and tweeds in which we choose to encase ourselves. Upon the whole, living in China appears to be cheap for the Chinese. That they find no difficulty in living cheaply when removed to other countries, we know very well. It remains to be seen what effect upon their tastes their surroundings here will produce, and how much tradition and custom will shield them from the temptation to eat, dress, and lodge like native Americans.

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

III.

THE PLAN PROPOSED.

THE revision of 1611, usually styled the "authorized" or "standard" translation of the Bible, because it was executed and "appointed to be read in churches," by royal authority, has been generally accepted by English-speaking Protestants as both an eminently beautiful and, in the main, a sufficiently accurate version of the sacred Scriptures. It has, nevertheless, been much criticised, and numerous attempts have been made, sometimes by dissenting sects, sometimes by individuals both in and out of the English Church, to correct its alleged errors, to improve its diction, or to supplant it by an entirely new translation. These experiments, though frequently begun under imposing auspices and conducted with much labor and learning, have met with but indifferent success, and we believe that no English Protestant denomination now habitually reads the Bible in any other text than in that of the Version of 1611.

The necessity of a new authoritative recension of the English Bible has been much discussed in the Anglican Church, and measures have at length been taken, by a branch of that organization, for carrying into effect a proposal so often made and so often rejected in the ecclesiastical councils of the State Church of England. On the 10th of February, 1870, Dr. Wilberforce, Bishop of Winchester, submitted to the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury a resolution providing for the appointment of a "joint committee of both Houses, with power to confer with any committee that might be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the *New Testament*, whether by marginal note or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translation made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist." The resolution was favorably entertained, but, to use the words of Blunt,* "in the course of half an hour it underwent a gigantic transformation, by being made to comprehend the *Old Testament* and the Hebrew text also." Seven bishops of the Upper House and fourteen members of the Lower were appointed on this committee.

The committee, for reasons not stated by Blunt, "met with no co-operation from the Convocation of York," but on the 11th of May, 1870, it submitted a report, recommending a revision of the Authorized Version, "comprising both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of that version." The third article of the report was thus worded: "That, in the above resolutions, we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary;" the fourth, "That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed;" the fifth, "That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

The report was accepted by the Convocation, though not without opposition in the Lower House, and a joint committee of sixteen persons was

appointed "to consider a scheme of revision on the principles laid down," and "to invite the co-operation of those whom they may judge fit, from their Biblical scholarship, to aid them in their work."

On the 25th of May, 1870, the committee adopted ten resolutions, the first seven dividing the members into "two companies, the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament," nominating the members of the two companies, and advising that several "scholars and divines," indicated by name, but not belonging to Convocation, though all, we believe, Englishmen, and nearly all clergymen of the Established Church, "be invited to join" the respective companies. The eighth resolution lays down the general principles to be followed by both companies, among which are:

- "1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.
- "2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the authorized and earlier English versions.
- "3. Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally.
- "4. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating.
- "5. To make no changes in the text, except two-thirds of those present approve the same.
- "6. To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions."

The remainder of the resolutions refer only to the mode of proceeding and form of the revision, and are of no special interest, except as indicated hereafter.

The report and resolutions of the committee were adopted by Convocation, and it is understood that the two companies of revisors have begun their labors.

The proceedings of the Convocation excited a good deal of interest in England, and, on the 14th of June, Mr. Buxton moved, in the House of Commons, "that an humble address be presented to her Majesty, praying that she would be graciously pleased to invite the President of the United States to concur with her Majesty in appointing commissioners to revise the Authorized Version of the Bible." This motion was supported by Mr. Buxton in a very able speech, and a debate followed, in the course of which Mr. Gladstone, in the name of the Ministry, opposed the motion, chiefly on the ground that it was inexpedient, or at least premature, for the Government to take any steps in regard to a revision, and that it was better to leave it to the "free agencies of those powers of piety, zeal, and learning" which, as Mr. Gladstone had no doubt, "existed in England in ample sufficiency for the attainment of the end." Many eminent members of Parliament took part in the debate, and, among others, Mr. Beresford Hope, proprietor of the *Saturday Review*, whose speech was distinguished by that minute and intimate knowledge of the American people, their history and their institutions, that candid and generous appreciation of their character and their action, and that conscientious and painstaking regard for exact truth, which are so conspicuous in all this gentleman's writings and discourses on the United States, as well as in most of the articles on American subjects in his *Review*. Mr. Newdegate also enlightened the House on an obscure point of American history by informing the members that, "when Washington desired to establish a church in the United States, he was prevented by Jefferson, behind whom was Carroll, the brother of the first Jesuit who was made a bishop, and in the Jesuits' history that achievement was boasted of as one of the successes of their order."

In consequence of the opposition of the Ministry, Mr. Buxton withdrew his motion, and the sole responsibility of the undertaking now rests with the Convocation of the Archbishopric of Canterbury.

Two objections suggest themselves at once upon a view of this plan. The first is that it is a purely sectarian, not to say schismatic, movement, and, as such, calculated to widen rather than to narrow the divisions which exist between the different Protestant churches of the English speech; the other, that it is evidently a half-measure, aiming at no thorough work which shall establish the readings of the original text and of the English Bible on a reasonably satisfactory and permanent basis.

It is remarkable that the scheme recommended by the Committee of Revision is narrower and less liberal than that proposed by the report of the Bishop of Winchester, which is itself again less broad and comprehensive than the resolutions first moved by that prelate in Convocation.

* "A Plain Account of the English Bible, from the Earliest Times of its Translation to the Present Day. By John Henry Blunt, M.A., F.S.A." London: Rivingtons. 1870.

The Bishop of Winchester's original resolutions provided specifically for the correction of errors in the English *New Testament* arising from the adoption of a faulty "Greek text" by the translators of 1611, and they were amended in Convocation so as to comprehend the *Old Testament* and "the Hebrew text also." The report of the Bishop of Winchester accepted by Convocation does not refer at all to the Hebrew and Greek texts, but it authorizes the Committee of Revision "to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong." The scheme of the Committee of Revision, in the fourth section of its eighth article, directs that, "when the text adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin," but otherwise it nowhere alludes to the original texts at all, and, instead of inviting the co-operation of learned foreigners and dissenters, it empowers each of the two companies "to refer, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions."

It would be uncandid to deny that some critical revision of the Hebrew and Greek originals is implied in this scheme, but it is evident that such revision—a labor which ought to form the very basis of the whole undertaking, and which requires for its execution the most advanced Oriental and Biblical learning of our times—occupies but a very subordinate place in the minds of the committee, and that when they narrowed down "the co-operation" of eminent scholars, without regard to nationality or religious denomination, to simply asking "the opinions of divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, when considered desirable" by either of the companies, they meant to exclude all such scholars, except the few English divines and laymen whom they invited to join the companies, from any general participation in the work, and from all equality of authority in the decision of questions of reading and interpretation.

But, as an indication of the superficial character of the work proposed by the committee, the third section of the eighth article is the most remarkable and the most important. It is in these words: "Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting [by two-thirds] as hereinafter is provided." Upon two readings, then, the recension of the original Hebrew and Greek texts, and the wording of the translation—a translation which, as has often been shown, is the growth of many centuries—are to be definitively settled by a two-thirds vote of such members of the respective companies as may happen to be present when the vote is taken! The proof-sheets of the simplest writing in our own language require much more than "two readings" before an experienced compositor feels any confidence in the accuracy of the typography, and certainly not one of the reverend gentlemen of the committee would allow a sermon of his own to go forth to the world upon such a revision as this. We freely admit that it is probable the committee means by this language more than it expresses, and that, in the way of critical labor, its members will perform more than they promise; but making every allowance which a liberal construction of the articles, and a due respect for the intelligence of the divines who compose the committee, authorize, it is not too much to say that the plan in question manifests, in itself, no just appreciation of the real character and extent of the duties and responsibility involved in the satisfactory performance of the important task the revisers have undertaken.

On the other hand, so far as the rules go, nothing can be sounder or more judicious than the principles laid down by the Committees of Convocation and of Revision in regard to the extent of changes in the standard translation and the diction of those changes. They are these:

1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.

2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English versions. We say these rules are sound, *as far as they go*, but they leave us wholly in the dark on one of the most important points involved in this whole discussion—the question, namely, to what extent they propose to modernize the vocabulary and style of the standard version. The first rule allows as few alterations as possible "consistently with faithfulness." But faithfulness to what? To the original text, or to the idiom of the English language considered as altogether a *living* speech? Will they retain all Wright's hundreds of archaisms, provided they are, or rather once were, true translations, or will they replace obsolete by still current words and phrases, and, if so, by what principles will they be guided in the substitution? On this question—a question which more than any other concerns the taste and intelligence of the ordinary reader, a question upon which, more than upon any other, will depend the quality of attractiveness of form in the

new revision as compared with the old—the report of the committee gives us no information whatever.

We spoke of the plan of Convocation as a sectarian, if not a schismatic, movement. It is sectarian, because it was originated and organized, and is to be controlled wholly, by divines of a single sect—the Established Church of England; and it is not uncharitable to ask, whether a proposal to remodel the English form of the authoritative basis of the Christian faith by a fraction of that sect, and upon a plan in which one of the two great ecclesiastical provinces of that church refuses all participation, does not savor of that tendency to schism which the Anglican Church, beyond all others, condemns as evincing an antichristian spirit.

The Bible of 1611 is the common property, and substantially the religious oracle, of sixty or seventy millions of English-speaking Protestants, of whom scarcely a tenth are directly or indirectly represented in the Convocation of the Southern Province of England, or in any manner admit the spiritual or ecclesiastical supremacy of that body. The proceedings of the Convocation do not recognize the remaining fifty or sixty millions—except their recusant brethren of York—as having any acknowledged religious status, or any common interest in the true interpretation of the law to which all Protestants alike appeal.

It would be invidious to discuss the personal fitness or unfitness of individual members of the companies of revision for the labor they have undertaken. Indisputably, there are among them many of England's most learned divines, as well as several gentlemen eminent for a thorough knowledge of the English language; but it will not be pretended, by any unprejudiced person who is acquainted with the sacred learning and literature of the day, that these companies embrace the ablest living Bibli-cists of Protestant Europe, or that, as Hebraists, Grecists, or Scriptural exegetists, their members have yet given proof of superiority to the foremost class of American scholars in the same departments.

If it is worth while now to undertake a new recension at all—which we by no means admit—the interests of Christian harmony require that the labor be inaugurated under the most catholic auspices, and that the composition of the board of revisers, and the principles upon which the revision is to be conducted, shall furnish every guaranty that the task shall be executed with all possible learning, all possible discretion, all possible fairness, charity, and candor. We find no such guaranties in the plan before us. It does not appear that the revisers propose to avail themselves of the amplest existing instrumentalities, or of the ablest living scholarship, or that they take sufficiently into view the claims, the capacities, and the wants of Protestants educated in theological schools different from their own. We admit—and this expectation is founded on a high appreciation of the general intelligence of the committee, not on satisfactory evidence of their special qualifications or of the soundness of their views in regard to the duties they have assumed—that their labors will result in an English text probably superior in accuracy of interpretation, and possibly even in uniform felicity of expression, to the standard translation. But we see no ground whatever for expecting that this recension will satisfy the reasonable demands of learned criticism, or that it will be a text which any considerable body of Protestants will adopt in place of what they have so long revered as an authoritative rendering of the original Scriptures, still less a version which the Christian public of England and America will accept, or ought to accept, as the only substitute which can be justifiably offered for the English Bible of 1611—namely, the best translation which the Biblical learning of the world and our present mastery of our mother tongue are capable of producing.

G. P. M.

PROFESSOR PORTER ON AMERICAN COLLEGES.*

OF all forms of literature, perhaps, there is none more carefully shunned by general readers than so-called educational works. Even when not distinctly and specifically technical, they are apt to be one-sided, are usually dry and limited in treatment, and often puerile. The weary associations of the *shop*, of the dull fagging at grammars and sum-books, is apt to hang about them; and whoever reads them does it as an unwelcome duty, not otherwise. But such a work as this of Professor Porter's claims the interest, or at least the attention, of all cultivated men. Even those who are not warmly interested in popular education as such, who care little or nothing about Pestalozzi and Froebel and Horace Mann, and nurse themselves with the soothing conviction that Tim O'Flaherty, and the other budding Presidents his playmates, will "tumble up" somehow

* "American Colleges and the American Public. By Noah Porter, D.D." New Haven: Chas. C. Chatfield & Co. 1870.

without the necessity of such elaborate educational apparatus as is now lavished upon them—even these will be likely to recognize the supreme importance to the educated classes of the college and the university. That essential differences in these institutions produce specific results among the higher classes of the community cannot be overlooked or denied. In that compound function which we call national character, to the three principal variables, race, climate, and political organization, must be added a fourth—school and university education; and no one who believes that social influences act from above downward can fail to recognize the immense effect in this regard of the college and college systems. It would be a lively illustration of this point to take the three types, the Yale or Harvard “graduate,” the Oxford “honor-man,” and the Berlin or Heidelberg “doctor,” and examine in how far his marked individuality is a product of his peculiar university course, and in what way he in turn reacts upon the community which has trained him. But for the present we are concerned only about the American student and the American college.

Among the advocates of various educational systems, Dr. Porter occupies what a Frenchman would call the Right Centre, or certainly a very moderate Right. To state his doctrine briefly, he is prepared, in a liberal spirit, but firmly, to *stare constitutis*. He accepts the conventional college system as it existed thirty years ago, as, in its main outlines, the right and the best, and the modifications which he consents to, or in some instances proposes, are corrective, not subversive.

In his first, or historical and introductory chapter, he reviews the efforts made in the last thirty or forty years to give greater scope and elasticity to the prescribed courses in the American colleges, and to open the way to a more liberal study of the so-called practical branches of science and literature. Without formal statement as an argument, considerable emphasis is laid on the fact that these efforts are by no means as new as many suppose, but date as far back as 1825-6, and that they have been experimental and not always satisfactory; that, indeed, to quote from Dr. Wayland, “we have been taught that the public does not always know what it wants, and that it is not always wise to take it at its word.” By a candid statement that he does not “regard the college system as faultless,” but, on the contrary, believes it “to be capable of some very important modifications and improvements,” he clears the way for Chapters II. and III., the “Studies of the American Colleges” and “The Prescribed Curriculum.”

In these chapters he plunges at once into the vexed question—perhaps the most important one in College Reform—the great case of Prescribed Studies *vs.* Electives, or, more properly, of Classics and Mathematics *vs.* Modern Languages and Natural Science. Here he takes decided though not bigoted ground. Admitting that an exclusive attention to the studies of the conventional course may be injurious, and should properly be supplemented by a fair quantum of History, Modern Languages, and Elementary Science, material and moral, he vigorously contests the expediency of omitting them, or even of materially diminishing their rank in the course. Assuming that college education is not, and in general should not be, professional and technical, but gymnastic, or, as a German would say, *propædæutic*, he earnestly defends the value of the classics and mathematics as pure training. He lays great stress on the fact that the study of the ancient languages is not, as has been asserted, a mere study of words and practice of memory, but, from their subtle and complicated grammatical structure, a very high and delicate metaphysical training, the most effective, perhaps, at least in connection with mathematics, which the youthful mind is in the average capable of receiving. This gymnastic merit he in great measure denies to the less philosophic structure of the modern languages, but consoles us with Mill’s assertion that “the mastery of Latin makes it easier to learn four or five of the Continental languages than it is to learn one of them without it.” As good mental furniture, and as a liberalizing and humanizing influence, he makes an eloquent defence of ancient literature, and quotes Goldwin Smith to the effect that, “though the classics are no longer what they were in the sixteenth century, they are still, perhaps, the best manual of humanity, and they are capable of being practically enlarged in their scope, and liberalized to an almost indefinite extent in the way of commentary and illustration.” Professor Porter’s suggestions as to various minor methods of rendering the study of the classics more attractive in character and fruitful in results to average college classes are worth serious attention from practical instructors.

His argument against substituting for these studies that of natural science, though somewhat diffusely stated, may be summed up in this,

that a mind untrained by the preparatory work he commends is not in condition to turn to physical science with the requisite vigor, nor with the philosophical breadth and acuteness, of the thoroughly trained student. This argument he further develops in the chapter on elective studies, in which he urges that a too great extension of the elective system leads to onesidedness, overhaste, and superficiality in the choice and method of studies, and condemns the attempt to engraft the purely technical preparation of the professional schools on the more universal curriculum of the undergraduate department. On this point he makes a bold statement, which, however, most friends of the highest culture will probably view with favor—that “the student who begins the study of theology or law in his sophomore or junior year, or pursues a course of reading which has special relation to his future profession, in ninety out of a hundred instances becomes a greatly inferior theologian or lawyer in consequence, and does not appreciably abridge the time required for his professional preparation.” Very noteworthy, too, is his reminder that the German *universities* form no standard for the American college; that the true counterpart of our college in studies, age of the students, previous preparation, and the like, is rather the German *gymnasium*, which in its whole character is precise and strict, and as far removed as possible from the democratic freedom of choice now sought to be introduced into our own institutions.

It would have been interesting to follow our author from step to step with argument or comment, but he tells his own story so well that we are fain to let him do it for himself. So far, probably, a fair share, perhaps even a majority, of the most discriminating friends of thorough intellectual culture will be inclined to agree with him that the classics and mathematics in reasonable measure and up to a reasonable age are, on the whole, the best average pabulum for the average human mind; that, this being so, it is wise to surround the study of them with certain safeguards of prescription; and that, in postponing the more special professional studies till the period of physical and mental manhood, we are only following the profound common-sense of the French proverb, “*reculer pour mieux sauter*.” We are equally inclined to approve the chapter on college recitations in contrast to examinations and lectures, but could have wished to see more attention given to the objections against the marking system as a distracting weariness to the professor, and more emphasis laid on the necessity of careful classification in the recitations, to avoid the utter demoralization consequent on setting the best scholars, for some hours per day, to listen to the blundering and shirking of the incapables. But we can heartily commend the professor’s comments on the duty of self-sacrificing work at actual *teaching* to many aspiring professors *in oco*, as well as to many actual incumbents, who, like Browning’s alderman, with slight alteration,

“Hope because they’re old and obese
To find in the furry college robe case.”

The chapter on the Religious Character of Colleges is one of those thorny tracts which the reviewer would gladly step over as gingerly as possible. Undoubtedly, in all quarters of the country out of sound of the bells of Brattle Street and the Old South, this chapter will find almost universal approval. With many of its arguments and its conclusions we are disposed heartily to go along, but the general question, whether it is wise to attempt to engraft any formal religious instruction, so-called, on the college course, or to imprint any technically religious character on the college as a body or a system, seems to us still open, spite of the Professor’s well-meant efforts to set it at rest. In view of his avowed liberality and aversion to sectarianism, it might be pertinent to remind him that what he stigmatizes with the name of “irreligion,” “atheism,” and the like—the doctrines of men like Emerson and Parker or Longfellow—might, by a not very forced construction, be considered to form a sect or sects of religious belief at large, though not perhaps of the Christianity which Professor Porter believes to include all religious possibility. In view, too, of the wide and almost preponderating influence of transcendental doctrines among the cultivated classes of New England, the Professor, according to his own theory of allowing any important sect a university or college organ, could hardly grumble if Harvard College came to represent even more distinctly than at present the extreme left of these tendencies.

It is to the credit of the Professor’s heart and temper that, in the chapters on Internal College Discipline, the Dormitory System, etc., he warmly defends the social intramural life of the students as a necessity to the full enjoyment of all the advantages of university residence. In this chapter, as in all the others, let us say, once for all, his suggestions of useful modi-

flections in the college government, the appointment of fellows, the intercourse between officers and students, and, in short, all the practical minutiae of college life, are extremely valuable. Nor are his hints less worthy of attention when he treats of broader matters, and throws out propositions as to the establishment of professional and scientific schools, and the enlightening and modifying, though not subverting, of the conventional systems hitherto existent. It is with regret that, in deference to the limits of time and space, we drop the consideration of this very able, earnest, scholarly, and, in almost all points, liberal treatise. We cannot refrain from quoting, as the key-note of the whole, a few of its last words:

"As long as study is valued for the money or position it procures, and the theory of disciplinary study and of liberal culture is openly scouted in the forum and the market-place and attacked in the newspaper and the review, so long will the true university be unknown among us. It is in the name and interest of true progress and of real reform that we protest against the supercilious and positive spirit in which the professed guides of the people—some of them graduates of colleges—have treated the aims and objects of education, as well as the contemptuous and ignorant appeals to the prejudices and ignorance of their readers which many have allowed themselves to employ."

Robert Falconer. A Novel, by George Macdonald, author of "David Elginbrod," "Alec Forbes of Howglen," etc. (Boston: Loring. 1870.)—Unless our memory serves us ill, the hero of this novel was first presented to Mr. Macdonald's readers in his last year's story of "David Elginbrod," where he figured toward the close of the book in the character of an amateur detective, possessed of a sort of Scotch second-sight, which stood him in good stead when he had on hand the business of discovering and restoring to her friends a young lady who had been spirited away by a villain who had thrown her into a magnetic slumber. That he was a remarkable person, whose history was well worthy to be recorded, even by his present biographer, we were assured even then—and it is, of course, a by no means bad story in which he now appears. Mr. Macdonald is always readable, both for what he says and for his way of saying it, although, for our part, we have never succeeded in liking him so well as in "Alec Forbes," in which we first made his acquaintance. In the present story, Robert Falconer appears as a boy of fourteen, a half-orphan, living with a Calvinistically-religious and severely-kind grandmother, and with a disreputable father, whom he has never seen but once and never hears mentioned, roaming somewhere about the world. It was to be expected that Robert's grandmother should occupy a very prominent part in this history. What would become of Mr. Macdonald, or, indeed, of many another writer of Scotch novels, if he could not draw us a character crushed or else drawn awry between the natural religious sentiment which inspires a belief in the benignity of God and the Calvinistic theory which contemplates his justice only? It is a sort of retribution, we suppose, which provides that what miserably edified the last generation should drearily amuse the present.

Robert is brought up by his grandmother after the strictest Calvinistic fashion; deprived of all amusement, made to study hard and to pray aloud in a corner of the parlor, not allowed to solace himself with music, for which he has a passion, and even doomed to see his grandfather's violin, a genuine Stradivarius, which he had found, and on which he had secretly learned to play, laid on the kitchen fire as a burnt-offering to the supposed divine decree against pleasure. Nevertheless, being a boy unusually large-hearted as well as large-brained (or else, the reader is told, he would not have been Mr. Macdonald's hero), and being informed, likewise, with a true Scotch sense of duty much akin to his grandmother's own, he sees under all this apparent harshness the real kindness and profound love with which she regards him—a love held in check, it is true, by the doubt whether he is foreordained unto salvation, but for that very reason all the more painfully sincere. He grows up, therefore, with undiminished respect and affection for his grandmother, but with growing doubts as to whether she has a true conception of God. Presently he falls in love with a woman several years his senior, who is herself in love with his dearest friend. Having an opportunity to go abroad, he tries to dissipate his grief by travel, and at the same time to provide himself with a theory of the universe which shall not only satisfy his theological doubts, but at the same time furnish him with a satisfactory answer to the questions of why he should suffer and how he shall best provide for his immediate future. Such a theory he works out for himself in the course of his meditations on the four Gospels; what it is, Mr. Macdonald states in a number of propositions which we do not quote; the practical result being that his hero

betakes himself to a life of philanthropy—having first been furnished by a relative with the means of living without a profession. As the particular object of his life, he proposes to himself the discovery and reformation of his father, and in the pursuit of this filial end becomes a familiar and affectionately respected acquaintance of all the poor and vicious people in London.

What particular end Mr. Macdonald proposed to himself in the creation of such a character as his hero, we find it difficult to conjecture. Beyond the story of his life, which is more interesting than probable, he seems to be intended to point a moral which we do not find it easy to draw. If it be, as we suspect, that Mr. Macdonald feels sceptical of accomplishing any really good work except by individual effort, and regards all organizations for effecting moral purposes as mere appendages to the individual which he does well to shake off as soon as possible, he seems to us to be elaborating in his own mind and suggesting in his novel a fallacy which a consideration of his own methods with his hero might perhaps show him. Undoubtedly, as he says, "God will take care of the man" when he undertakes God's work—but before he can undertake it on this wise even Mr. Macdonald has to provide him with an exceptional character, exceptional training, send him a disappointment in love, condemn him to a single life, and last, but by no means least, endow him with a fortune before starting him on his solitary philanthropic pilgrimage. His heroine, too, who, after her lover's death, betakes herself also to works of charity, and whose co-operation is almost the only one that Falconer will accept, has likewise to be rich and have a house of her own, where fallen women and stray babies may be taken in without the painful restraints of rules and regulations. Is it that an effectual call to good works may be known by its being accompanied by private means and perfect freedom from private duties? Mr. Macdonald would, doubtless, not say yes to such a question, but if he has any purpose at all it seems to be the preaching of individualism as opposed to combination; and that, in matters of charity at least, besides doing greatly less good to the innumerable objects of it, is likely also to ruin the charitable themselves, by inducing such spiritual pride as in the case of Falconer himself.

Still, apart from any consideration of the ideas suggested by the book—considerations which it is not so easy to set aside as it would be if Mr. Macdonald were less of a born preacher than he is, his story is readable and interesting.

The Lifted and Subsided Rocks of America. With their Influences on the Oceanic, Atmospheric, and Land Currents, and the Distribution of Races. By George Catlin. (London: Trübner & Co.)—Mr. Catlin's narrative of what he has seen in traversing North and South America and among the Antilles is, as usual, interesting to read, albeit his theories are little likely to attract the attention of the scientific world. That the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea have been the scene of vast volcanic disturbances, and that Central America and the West Indies have undergone one or more submersions, is, to be sure, no speculation, but a fact for which there is abundance of testimony. Whether the two continents were ever continuously united, as Mr. Catlin thinks, or whether the cataclysm to which we owe the ruins of Uxmal and Palenque gave rise to the Gulf Stream, is yet to be established. The origin, or any modification, of this heated current evidently holds an important relation to the climatic changes that have taken place on both sides of the Atlantic along its course, and is worth ascertaining if possible. The destruction caused by nature's cataclysm naturally leads our author to compare it with the subsequent destruction of the aborigines caused by the European settlement of this continent. From the fate of the Indians in this country—always a source of melancholy and shameful reflections to the American people—he passes in an appendix to his personal griefs, more particularly to the injurious slanders committed to print by the late Mr. Schoolcraft, and embalmed in the libraries of the world, under the sanction of the United States Government. Mr. Schoolcraft's defects as an Indian historiographer are now, however, so well understood that it seems at first a little unnecessary in Mr. Catlin to seek to protect himself against attacks from that source. Something, nevertheless, must be allowed to the sensitiveness of a man who in other ways has seen his labors dishonored by his countrymen; and we are quite sure that Congress might properly order the number of copies of "O-kee-pa" which Mr. Catlin wishes to have distributed as an antidote to Schoolcraft, and still more properly redeem that invaluable collection of Indian portraits and relics which is now in pawn to Mr. Catlin's necessities.

